

THE ECLECTIC REVIEW,

FOR MARCH, 1828.

- Art. I. 1. *Authenticated Report of the Discussion which took place between the Rev. Richard T. P. Pope, and the Rev. Thomas Maguire, in the Lecture Room of the Dublin Institution, on the 19th, &c. of April, 1827.* 8vo. pp. 374. Dublin. 1827.
2. *The Doctrine of the Trinity founded neither on Scripture, nor on Reason and Common Sense, but on Tradition and the Infallible Church: an Essay occasioned by a late Controversy between the Rev. Richard T. P. Pope and the Rev. Thomas Maguire. By William Hamilton Drummond, D.D. Second Edition, with considerable Additions.* 8vo. pp. 100. Dublin. 1827.
3. *The Difficulties of Romanism.* By George Stanley Faber, B.D. Rector of Long Newton. 8vo. pp. 392. Price 10s. 6d. London. 1826.
4. *An Account of the Indexes, both prohibitory and expurgatory, of the Church of Rome.* By the Rev. Joseph Mendham, M.A. 8vo. pp. 188. Price 7s. London. 1826.

THESE publications claimed an earlier notice. Should any of our readers, however, be disposed to view the controversy as gone by, they would be greatly mistaken. There are some over-wise, pacific persons who deprecate keeping alive the Romish controversy; under the idea, that it inflames the spirit of party, and widens the separation between the members of the opposite communions. The fact is otherwise. Controversy is the safety-valve of theological zeal. The spirit of party is opposed to it; being too intolerant for discussion. Truth has always triumphed by means of controversy: she has grown powerless only when the sleep of lethargy has stolen upon the Church. What is Christianity itself, but a standing controversy with the infidel, the sensualist, and the formalist,—the men of this world?

We admit that the spirit of controversy, or, to speak more properly, a controversial spirit, is not in itself very conducive

to the cultivation of personal piety. The angry controvertist and fierce polemic is not always a devout believer, or an amiable member of society. The Church has sometimes been as much disgraced by her advocates as annoyed by her assailants; and there are intestine debates and disputes which, as friends to religion as well as friends to peace, we could wish to have terminated for ever. But alive, as we trust we are, to the dangers of controversy, we must nevertheless protest against that timid, trimming, self-indulgent, ultra-liberal dread of religious debate, which would bind over Truth to keep the peace with Error, and consign those celestial weapons of the spiritual armoury, reason and Scripture, to the ark of the Church, as useless regalia.

For the sake of Ireland, let the Emancipation question fare as it may, we hope that the controversy will go forward. It may alarm the priests and displease the liberals, but it will tend to do good to both parties; and the people will be at all events the gainers by the circulation of knowledge. Ignorance is always a rancorous opponent; a blind, and therefore a cruel enemy. The tiger closes his eyes before he takes his fatal spring; and it is the same with man before he makes war upon his fellow. Ignorance is always intolerant, because it does not understand the reasons of its opponent. It is cruel, because it feels itself weak. Ignorance is always fearful; and fear, as Mr. O'Driscoll in his pithy manner remarks, 'is incapable of Christianity.' If, then, we would assuage the bitterness of party animosity, and allay the inveteracy of that hatred which springs from fear, we must let in the light of the press upon the contending parties, and promote those discussions which serve at least to make them better known to each other. If I can be brought to see and acknowledge that my adversary has reasons for his opinions and conduct, although those reasons appear to me insufficient and fallacious, I shall think of him with the less contempt, and at the same time, having proved my own standing to be good, shall feel towards him less apprehension. Now we never can know the true grounds of our opponent's belief and the real character of his arguments, till we learn them from himself; nor know, till they have withstood the test of assault, the validity of our own.

No Protestant, we may venture to assert, can know why he is so, or can understand what Protestantism is, in its principles, its genuine results, and the grounds upon which alone it is defensible, who has not taken pains to become acquainted with the real opinions of the Papists. There are thousands whose whole Protestantism is concentrated in a hatred of Popery,—of Popery, not in the abstract as a system of error, but an his-

torical personification, a robed and mitred phantom which haunts their dreams. They do not hate it because it is false, but because it may be mischievous; not because it enslaves the minds of millions, but because it may prove a source of inconvenience to themselves. Such is the true Orange-man,—the backwoodsman of the Protestant Church, himself differing but little from the victims of his warfare, and retarding, by his conduct, the advance of that moral civilization on which he prides himself. There are thousands who have no quarrel with Popery, but as being the *Irish religion*. It might establish itself and prosper elsewhere, and welcome. The Protestantism of others is of a less noxious, because more negative character. They neither abhor the error, nor hate those who hold it, but are for every country's having its own religion, as well as its own climate and customs; all religions being, in their estimation, equally good on their proper soil; and they are Protestants just because that system is indigenous to England. Such persons are sworn enemies to all religious discussion, to all measures of proselytism, to every thing like theological zeal. They can tolerate all creeds, but not all religions, being very apt to despise those who have more zeal than themselves, and to suspect all ministers of religion of priestcraft. Their liberality is the spurious growth of religious ignorance; and towards all who hold a less tolerant creed than their own, they often display a most unphilosophical bigotry.

Besides these two classes of nominal Protestants, there are other descriptions of persons in this country, to whom a better acquaintance with the Romish controversy might be highly serviceable. Since that controversy has slumbered among us, it is certain, that Protestantism has, in many high quarters, undergone considerable deterioration. The doctrine of Justification as held and maintained by many divines of the present day, is certainly not the same that was advanced by Luther and defended by Hooker. Nor are the grounds of Protestantism by any means clearly understood and recognized by the major part of the Protestant clergy. It is a most remarkable fact, that towards Protestantism as such, when undignified by Episcopacy, the clergy of England have never discovered any very kindly feeling. It has only been upon emergencies, and as it were by compulsion, that the principles of the Reformation have in later days been brought into the field. The fear that the Dissenters should get possession of the great guns, has led to a very cautious employment of the true Protestant artillery. Hence, the champions of the English Church have generally preferred to attack the errors, rather than the claims of the Church of Rome,—to disprove its infal-

libility, rather than to expose its usurpation; and have talked more of the political danger, than of the spiritual wickedness of Popery. With regard to the sacred right of private judgement in matters of faith,—that is to say the unalienable right of conscience which springs from our accountability to God for our belief,—it is given up by many who call themselves Protestants, as a principle indefensible, latitudinarian, and dangerous; and in its place is substituted a principle which is neither Catholic nor Protestant,—the public right of national churches. Such was the Protestantism, we admit, of Henry VIII. and Elizabeth, but not of Luther and Wicliffe, nor yet of Chillingworth and Barrow.

Gladly then do we hail that resurrection of genuine Protestant principles which is taking place in Ireland, as the consequence of the stir of controversy and the activity of religious inquiry. Those principles which achieved the first great reformation, can alone bring about a second revolution that shall deserve the name; and when Protestants better understand those principles, they will be able to make more efficient use of their weapons, and with better success.

‘If the infallibility of the Latin Church could be clearly established,’ Mr. Faber remarks, ‘no person could rationally object to her theological decisions: for it were palpable madness in a fallible being, to contend against acknowledged infallibility. Hence I have ever thought that the establishment of infallibility is the very *nucleus* of the Roman controversy.’ In our judgement, it is far from being so. If the question lay merely between two rival churches differing in their theological decisions, the one laying claim to infallibility, and the other resisting that claim, Mr. Faber would be right. But who does not know, that this abstract infallibility is a point of honour with the Romish Church, rather than the foundation of its claims?—just as it is a point of honour with the English Church, to maintain its own authority and immaculate orthodoxy. The infallibility of the Pope is given up by every enlightened Romanist. The necessary or inherent infallibility of councils cannot be maintained, the authority of certain councils only being recognized. The Romish casuists are compelled to say, that the infallibility of a council is dependent upon the subsequent approbation of the holy see, two fallibles thus making up one compound infallibility. But this infallibility, with which the Romanist is so much embarrassed that he does not know where to deposit it, is but an attribute of that authority which he claims for his Church, not the essence of the thing. The Church of England disclaims infallibility, yet asserts its own authority in matters of faith. If

such authority can be substantiated, then it may be fairly argued, that infallibility must attach to the Church which is invested with it. But the possession of such infallibility would not establish the authority of the Church in any other character than that of a witness. Were the Church of Rome to abandon its claim to abstract and absolute infallibility, its claims to spiritual domination would remain much the same; since it is manifest, that submission is challenged to an authority dispensed at least by a fallible administration, and therefore separable from infallibility in the person as well of the Pope as of the priest.

‘ I may premise,’ says Mr. Maguire, ‘ that the Pope’s infallibility is not a doctrine of mine, nor of any Catholic. There are differences on the subject between the French and ultra-Montanists; but they are merely the private opinions of private divines. The Church has pronounced no opinion on it. The Church only pronounces on essentials. It leaves the mind free to discuss other subjects respecting which infallibility does not shut out inquiry. But the authority of the Church is decisive in articles of faith which cannot be ascertained by human power. How could the mass of mankind be able to judge of the truth of the doctrine of the Trinity, or of justification by faith; how could they reconcile with a just God the doctrine of original sin?’ &c. pp. 47, 8.

Mr. Maguire went much too far in asserting, that no Catholic, or scarcely any one, believed in the infallibility of the Pope; but he was quite correct in stating, that such an opinion is not an essential article of the Romish faith. Mr. Pope, in his reply, shews that the Church of Rome has not yet been able to decide as to the seat of her supposed infallibility; and with regard to the general councils, it still remains a question among Romanists, whether the fifth Lateran be truly a General Council.

But there is a previous question—and this we deem the nucleus of the controversy—relating to the authority of which this infallibility is predicated, the nature of that authority and its legitimate depository. It might be said with truth by the Protestant to a Roman Catholic,—We too admit that Christ has left us an infallible mode of determining the truth; we believe in the infallibility of the Church. Its infallibility is secured by the inspiration of those holy apostles who, by their teaching and writings, constitute the foundation of the edifice. It is purely by means of this infallible decision, that we judge of the truth of the doctrine of the Trinity, of justification by faith, or of any other article of faith. The only question between us on this point, is, where infallibility stops. Protestants limit it to direct inspiration, attested by miraculous credentials; and in the dictates of inspiration contained in the apostolic writings, we have an infallible and a sufficient guide.

Protestants hold as firmly as the Romanists can do, the impossibility that their system of theology should be essentially erroneous. We do not require the evidence of tradition in support of the fact, that we derive that system from the apostles themselves: we appeal to their own writings. But those writings, rejoins the Romanist, have been diversely expounded: who is to determine which exposition is the truth? This question, Mr. Faber meets by first noticing the answer of the Romanist—‘Consult the Catholic Church. This,’ he remarks, ‘may be very good advice in the abstract; but the difficulty is, to explain how such advice must be followed. Had the Church never varied, we might have had some reasonable expectation of success.’ It is necessary that we should be told, at what period the Catholic Church is to be consulted. The Church of the Romanist, Mr. Faber might have shewn to be in fact, the *Council of Trent*. He then proceeds as follows:

‘Others, perhaps, will exhort us to call in the right of private judgement, which has often been described, more eloquently than wisely, as a main principle of Protestantism, and which the bishop of Aire *not unjustly reprobates as leading to nothing but confusion*. Of this principle as exhibited by the bishop, and not unfrequently as exhibited also by unwary Protestants, I entertain not a much higher opinion than the bishop himself does. The exercise of *insulated* private judgement, which in effect is the abuse of *legitimate* private judgement, must clearly convert the church catholic into a perfect Babel; and although I deny the right of *such* private judgement to be a principle either of sound Protestantism in general, or of the Anglican Church in particular, yet I regret to say that it has much too often been exercised, to the scandal of all sober men, and to the unspeakable detriment of genuine religion.

‘To a certain extent, the bishop of Aire will allow, that private judgement *must* be exercised. Thus, I cannot read his lordship’s very able work, and come to a conclusion upon it, without *so far* exercising private judgement; and the very tenor of the whole composition implies, that private judgement in the choice of their religion will be exercised by those English travellers for whose especial benefit it seems to have been written. Thus, likewise, *we shall introduce an universal scepticism, if we deny the right of forming a private judgement upon perfectly unambiguous propositions*. No authoritative explanation can throw any additional light upon the several prohibitions of murder, and theft, and adultery, which occur in Holy Scripture. We read those prohibitions in the sacred volume; we involuntarily exercise our private judgement upon their import; and, by its mere simple exercise alone, we are *all* brought, without any need of inquiring the sense of the church, to one and the same interpretation. In these matters, and in various others which might easily be specified, I hold private judgement to be strictly legitimate; and I feel persuaded that the bishop of Aire will not disagree with me.

‘But, though there is such a thing as *legitimate private judgement*

in matters of religion, there doubtless is such a thing also as *illegitimate private judgement*. Now this last modification I would define to be, *private judgement in the interpretation of litigated passages of Scripture, exercised after a perfectly independent or insulated manner*.

‘Against *this* exercise of private judgement, which is a lamentable abuse of the Reformation, all prudent and judicious men must strenuously protest. It assuredly can only be the fruitful parent of discord and error. For if, without using those means of ascertaining the truth which God has put into our hands, this man and that man, after a simple inspection of a litigated text, shall *dogmatically and independently* pronounce that such or such an interpretation *must* set forth its true meaning; we shall doubtless have small prospect of ever arriving at a reasonable certainty in regard to the mind of Scripture. The absurdity of such a proceeding is self-evident; for, if each individual, disdaining all *extrinsic* aid, is to be his own independent expositor, we may well nigh have as many expositions of litigated texts as there exist rash and ignorant and self-opinionated individuals; and accordingly, we must not dissemble, that, from the *illegitimate* exercise of *insulated* private judgement, sects rivalling each other in presumptuous, unscriptural folly, have sprung up like mushrooms. Thus acted not the wise reformers of the Church of England. I greatly mistake if, in any one instance, they can be shewn to have exercised that *insulated* private judgement which I agree with the bishop in heartily reprobating. In fact, they possessed far too much theological learning, and far too much sound intellect, to fall into the palpable error now before us.’ *Faber*, pp. 37—40.

We have cited this passage at length, in order that our readers may have fairly before them, this new Protestant doctrine of a public-private judgement, in the very language of its learned advocate. A more singular specimen of involution of ideas and perplexed reasoning, could hardly be cited from the pages of any Protestant writer. It is perfectly amusing to see, how Mr. Faber is compelled by turns to admit and to retract, to shift and quibble, to invent qualifying epithets and slip in saving clauses, because, in attempting to defend Protestantism, he forsakes the true Protestant ground. We entreat the patience of our readers while we endeavour to unthread this maze of words, and reduce to something like intelligible propositions the statements they involve.

The question before us is, Who is to determine which exposition of God’s inspired word is the truth? The answer given by the Romanist, is, Consult the Church. Mr. Faber’s answer is substantially the same—Consult the Church. Each does not, it is true, refer us to the same Church. The Bishop of Aire says, Consult the Holy Romish Church; the Rector of Long Newton would say, Consult the Reformed Anglican Church. But both agree in referring us to an authority dis-

inct from the Scripture, and opposed to the exercise of private judgement.

Mr. Faber does not scruple to avow, that he agrees with the Romanist in reprobating the right of private judgement,—that is, *the right of appeal on the part of private Christians to the inspired standard.* ‘Insulated private judgement,’ if the words mean any thing, must imply neither more nor less than this,—the independent exercise of a man’s own faculties on the meaning of those Holy Scriptures which God has given him for his rule of faith and practice. Mr. Faber denies that the Christian has any such right; he has no business to exercise his private judgement upon litigated passages; he must accept implicitly of the interpretation furnished by the Church. Who gave Mr. Faber, or who gave the Pope, the right to say this? Who gave the Church that dominion over our faith which an Apostle disclaimed?

But Mr. Faber has grossly caricatured the Protestant doctrine, and by so doing, has played into the hands of the Papist. He would represent the independent exercise of private judgement to mean, not a judgement independent of human authority, but independent of all extrinsic means of coming to a right decision. He would represent those who maintain this right of private judgement, as disdaining the help of learning, as undervaluing the aids of expositors and pious divines, as despising the Christian ministry. We acquit Mr. Faber of any intention to misrepresent or calumniate any class of his fellow Protestants; but he does so in effect. The legitimacy of the right of private judgement, as an essential part of Christian liberty, cannot be suspended upon the use or abuse which may be made of that right by individuals. It were just as absurd to denounce civil liberty, because it might be illegitimately exercised. Mr. Faber represents all Protestants, however, who contend for the right of ‘insulated private judgement’, as countenancing the insulated, ignorant, and dogmatical exercise of it. To search the Scriptures for ourselves, to endeavour by a serious examination of the sacred text to ascertain which exposition of a litigated passage is the true one, is, we are told, ‘a lamentable abuse of the Reformation’, which the Rector of Long Newton unites with all good Papists in heartily reprobating. Not so Bishop Horsley in that manly declaration which cannot be too often cited. ‘It is incredible to any one who has not made the experiment, what a proficiency may be made in that knowledge which maketh wise unto salvation, by studying the Scriptures in this manner’ (comparing parallel texts), ‘without any other commentary or exposition than what

‘the different parts of the sacred volume mutually furnish for each other. . . . Let him (the most illiterate Christian) study them in the manner I recommend, and let him never cease to pray for the illumination of that Spirit by which these books were dictated; and the whole compass of abstruse philosophy and recondite history shall furnish no argument with which the perverse will of man shall be able to shake this learned Christian’s faith. The Bible thus studied will indeed prove to be what we Protestants esteem it, *a certain and sufficient rule of faith and practice*; a helmet of salvation which alone may quench the fiery darts of the wicked.’ *

By the right of private judgement, every one who advocates that right, intends, and is known to intend, the right of the private examination of Scripture with a view to the satisfaction of our own conscience as to the matter proposed for our belief;—the right and duty of individually building our faith exclusively upon the Divine testimony. Those who hold this main principle of Protestantism, so far from disdaining extrinsic aid, have always been characterized as the most diligent in the use of *every* means of coming to a right decision. What has given birth to Biblical criticism, what has created that vast fund of Biblical learning which we now possess, what has rescued many portions of the sacred text from corruption or obscurity, and the sacred volume itself from neglect, but that principle which Mr. Faber agrees with the Papist in reprobating ‘as leading to nothing but confusion’? Who are those whose anxiety to understand the word of God leads them the most constantly to attend upon the preaching and exposition of it by Christian ministers,—who are found to be the most diligent readers both of the sacred volume and of expository aids,—but that class of Protestants who act the most strictly up to the principle of exercising their own judgement and satisfying their own conscience in matters of faith? Nor let it be said, that such persons, while holding and exercising this right, do in fact submit their minds to human authority in the sense intended by the Romanist. Authority, as we shall presently see, is a very equivocal, and therefore convenient word; but the sole authority recognized by the description of Protestants referred to, is the Bible, the Bible only, without note or comment, as the exclusive law of faith, the unambiguous code of Heaven,—“a lamp unto our feet, and a light unto our path.”

In order to illustrate the illegitimacy and danger of the Protestant principle, the right of private judgement, Mr. Faber

* Bishop Horsley’s Nine Sermons, pp. 226—228.

and Mr. Maguire have both recourse to the case of the *soi-disant* Unitarian. The work denominated "The Improved Version" is referred to by the former, as the most perfect example of the illegitimate exercise of insulated private judgement with which he is acquainted.

'Totally opposing itself to the decisions of the Catholic Church nearest to the times of the Apostles, it exhibits interpretations of the litigated texts framed upon the mere independent dogmata of Dr. Priestley and Mr. Belsham, but altogether unknown to the ecclesiastics of the three first centuries. I adduce this production to exemplify what I mean by the *illegitimate use of private judgement*. If we ask a reason *why* the litigated texts are thus expounded, no answer can be given, save the good pleasure of the editor.' p. 44.

A more unhappy exemplification of his meaning in every respect, Mr. Faber could not have adduced; and we are astonished that a person of his learning could have so grossly committed himself. Whatever be the demerit of the interpretative notes attached to the "Improved Version", to represent them as embodying the independent dogmata of two individuals, is most absurd. We question whether an *original* interpretation of a litigated text is to be found in the volume. Is Mr. Faber so little conversant with the history of Biblical criticism as not to know, that Arian and Socinian interpretations of every litigated passage are older than the days of Dr. Priestley? It is utterly incorrect, that the Editor's private judgement is the only reason assignable for such expositions, erroneous and unscriptural as they are. Mr. Faber ought to have known, that, so far from disdaining extrinsic aid, the individuals he mentions claim at least to be regarded as men of learning; and that, so far from resting their creed upon private judgement, Unitarians have discovered a great anxiety to press into their service the authorities of fathers and the opinions of primitive antiquity, as well as some illustrious modern names. But would Mr. Faber deny that the Editor had a right to publish that Version with all its notes? What better right could the Rector of Long Newton possess, to publish his private judgement respecting the meaning of the prophecies? Mr. Faber's reasoning is fatal to even the liberty of the press; and indeed, to be consistent, he must deplore that it is now independent, in this country, of an episcopal '*Imprimatur*.'

Let us see, however, what our Author would substitute as the golden mean between Romanism and genuine Protestantism.

'Omitting, then, the mere dogmatism of the Latin Church on the one hand, and the wanton exercise of illegitimate private judgement

on the other hand, the practice of those profound and venerable theologians who presided over the reformation of the Anglican Church will teach us, that the most rational mode of determining differences is, *a recurrence to first principles* —

Had Mr. Faber closed his sentence here, who would not have given him credit for meaning by first principles, the dictates of the Divine oracles? But, alas! the complete sentence undeceives us.

—‘a recurrence to first principles, or an appeal to that primitive Church which was nearest the times of the apostles.’ p. 40.

In other words, to be able to understand the true interpretation of litigated passages of Scripture, we must call in—the Fathers, the New Testament Apocrypha; we must lay aside Wetstein and Griesbach for Irenæus, Justin Martyr, and Origen.

Let us now hear Mr. Maguire.

‘If the unlimited right of private judgement be recognized, then will a seven-fold shield be thrown over every error, however impure, every heresy, however damnable, every folly, however ridiculous. It will be the origin of every species of madness, violence, and fanaticism. What will each of the heretics say? “I exercise my judgement conscientiously and to the best of my ability; I have prayed to God that he might enlighten me with his grace. I have taken every means in my power to arrive at the truth, and my decided conviction now is, that Christ is not the Son of God.” Thus would Arianism, that heresy which distracted the Church of Christ, and which, if the protecting influence of the Almighty had not been extended to his Church, would have eradicated every Christian principle, and sapped the foundations of that heavenly and noble edifice, become justifiable. How could Mr. Pope blame the Arian? Mr. Pope would appeal to the Scriptures—but in vain he would appeal to the Scriptures against the obstinate Arian, or Socinian. They would, in reply, appeal to their conscience. They will say, that they have read the Scriptures, and that they have as good a right to interpret their meaning as Mr. Pope. Can Mr. Pope, who recognizes the principle of Gospel liberty, blame them for their conduct? Will he, in this regard, violate that principle which is the boast of the Reformation? Who is to judge between Mr. Pope and the Socinian, or Arian? God alone can be their judge, and that not till the soul is separated from the body.’ p. 11.

In a subsequent speech, Mr. Maguire cites the broad assertion of the Rev. Mr. O’Callaghan, a Protestant clergyman, that ‘*the right of private judgement is not recognized in the Church of England*’; and he triumphantly avails himself of the Rev. Mr. Rose’s *caveat* against this dangerous right, the alleged ‘base and boast of Protestantism,’ as the source of all

the neologism and infidelity that have over-run the Continent. Mr. Faber's work had probably not fallen in his way, or he would not have failed to avail himself of a third Protestant authority against this great Protestant principle. He then proceeds to reduce his opponent, as he imagines, to an inextricable dilemma.

'The Socinian comes to Mr. Pope, and says: I agree with you in your principle of private judgement—I agree with you, that the Scriptures are the inspired word of God; but you, Mr. Pope, have corrupted the sense of the Scriptures. You put upon them an interpretation which they will not, cannot bear. You admit articles of faith which are opposed to the Scriptures, and contrary to common sense. You hold, in common with me, that there is no way of judging or interpreting the sacred Scriptures, except according to private judgement, or, in other words, common sense. Again, you say, that a woman conceived an infant through a supernatural agency. Here, also, is a romantic interpretation, quite impervious to reason and to common sense. You should (concludes the Socinian) understand all those texts in a figurative sense. Mr. Pope will then recur to various passages of Scripture, to prove the divinity of Christ; but when he urges his interpretation against that of the consistent Socinian, the latter will contend for his equal right to interpret them; and he will justly inquire, Is no man but Mr. Pope to be allowed to exercise the right of private judgement? I have as good a right to believe in the existence of an infallible church, and the Socinian as good a right to maintain his own interpretation, and reject all mysteries, as Mr. Pope has to believe in his principles. When Mr. Pope endeavours to urge his interpretation on the Socinian, he abandons his own principles. Mr. Pope has no right to blame any man for having exercised his private judgement. Or is that a privilege to be exercised *exclusively* by the saints and the "elect"? Let Mr. Pope get out of that predicament if he can. If he can clear up that difficulty, he will indeed be a *Magnus Apollo*.' p. 89.

Mr. Pope's reply to this shallow argumentation, is as follows.

'When I believe that my view of a particular subject is correct, and that of a fellow-man erroneous, I surely do not interfere with his private judgement in endeavouring by argument to effect a change in his views. I appeal to his judgement, in order to convince him of his error. I would not, I could not force his judgement; but I would endeavour by argument to carry conviction to his mind. An individual, surely, may be convinced of the soundness of his opinion without laying claim to infallibility. I believe, indeed, that the man who holds not the divinity of Christ, is in fatal error. I believe, that, if he continue under its influence, he will perish; and I would use my exertions to reclaim him. Reason, we must remember, has its legitimate province. A doctrine may be *above* our reason, and not *opposed* to it

‘How does Mr. Maguire endeavour to convince the Socinian? By the authority of his Church. I deny *in toto*, replies the Socinian, her infallibility; how can I argue with you who refuse an appeal to common sense, to Scripture, and to fact; for all these overthrow the supposed infallibility of your Church? On the other hand, I entertain some hope, that arguing on the principles of private judgement, I shall be enabled, under the Divine blessing, to convince the man who will not listen to Mr. Maguire. I argue upon authority—the sacred Scriptures—which the Socinian admits: Mr. Maguire argues with him on ground which he will not acknowledge—the infallibility of the Church of Rome.’ pp. 93, 94.

This is very just and much to the point; but we must confess that we could have wished Mr. Pope had argued the question relating to the right of private judgement, somewhat more closely. Throughout this arduous six days’ debate, he displayed great ability, extensive information, and a clear, logical head; and, if not indued with all the polemic adroitness of his adversary, he shewed himself more than a match for him in every solid requisite for the controversy. Mr. Maguire acquitted himself, however, very creditably in every respect, considering the cause he had to advocate; and the discussion is interesting and valuable in no ordinary degree. Perhaps it may be admitted, that both parties discover more talent in the assault, than when acting on the defensive; and if there is any respect in which Mr. Pope has disappointed us, it is in not more completely exposing the misrepresentations and blunders of his opponent upon the subject which he selected for his first attack; namely, ‘the divine right of private judgement to pronounce upon the authenticity, integrity, and canonicity of Scripture, and to determine their meaning in articles of faith.’ Mr. Maguire calls on Mr. Pope to shew, ‘how a Protestant, literate or illiterate, can make an act of faith or belief on the Divine inspiration of the sacred Scriptures.’

‘My observation was,’ he continues, ‘that Mr. Pope could not urge any interpretation at all upon the Socinian, without violating the principle of private judgement I, on the other hand, might not be able to convert the Socinian, but he could not say that I contradicted myself. I would deny to the Socinian the right to interpret the Scriptures by private judgement. That would be leaving the Word of God dependent on the whim and caprice of every individual. The Word of God, I maintain, depends for its interpretation on the Church.’ p. 100.

Mr. Maguire asserts, that the children of Protestants must, on Mr. Pope’s principle, remain infidels till they arrive at years of discretion. This ridiculous assertion, his opponent meets with a direct denial; adding,—

‘ Much, I admit, devolves on parents and pastors. Their *authority* I recognize, but **AUTHORITY IS ONE THING, INFALLIBILITY ANOTHER.** Is not a Roman Catholic child precisely in the same circumstances?’ p. 106.

The words given by Mr. Pope in small capitals, contain something very much like a truism; but what he here means by authority, is by no means clear. We regret that he did not more directly meet Mr. Maguire’s reiterated challenge, and vindicate the Protestant principle from the absurd consequences charged upon it. He should have shewn, that the right of private judgement is not asserted as including in itself a rule of interpretation, but as the simple and only means of making an act of faith (to use Mr. Maguire’s phrase) upon the Word of God; that it involves the rejection of no authority that offers itself in the form of testimony, evidence, or teaching; accepting Tradition as a witness, though not submitting to it as a judge, and fully recognizing and establishing the duty of the parent and of the Church, to *teach*, while it refers to the inspired rule as the only medium of *proof*. All the plausibleness of Mr. Maguire’s pleading turns upon his confounding testimony and the means of instruction, with the authority which proposes itself as a rule in place of the Word of God.

What is that authority? This question brings us back to the *nucleus* of the controversy. There is the authority attaching to a record, and there is the authority attaching to a law; but these are not the same species of authority. The one is the only authority to which antiquity can lay claim: the other is exclusively inherent in the sacred scriptures, the only law of faith. There is, again, the authority of the witness, and the authority of the judge; the authority of the parent, and that of the magistrate; the authority of the historian, and that of the lawyer. In each case, the authority is different, the same word being used in a different sense. To one description of authority, I owe civil obedience; to another, the homage of my affections and my confidence; to a third I bow my opinion; but the only authority that can control my reason is, *evidence*. Now testimony is a species of evidence in itself, affording a reason for belief, and adapted to inspire belief; otherwise we should be incapable of being taught. Human testimony, being only the evidence of probability, cannot *demonstrate* the truth of what it affirms; but, in the absence of any reason for doubt, the probability it supplies, is received as a sufficient reason for our believing. This evidence of probability is susceptible, moreover, of being carried to so high a pitch by the accumulation of competent testimony, as to become all but irresistible;

and resistance against sufficient evidence, implies either a perverted understanding or a wilful opposition to the truth.

The authority of the Church as an interpreter of Scripture, is of this description. It is an historical testimony, carrying with it a high degree of probability, although unfortunately vitiated, in some instances by the imperfection of the record, and in others, by the incompetent character of the witness. We admit, however, that the concurrent voice of antiquity has the force of evidence; and, as an historical authority, its testimony on many points is sufficient for our guidance. But does the existence of such authority or evidence preclude the right of private judgement, or does it oppose that exercise of judgement to which it makes its appeal? If it be evidence, it affords good reason for my believing; but such belief can take place only by that exercise of private judgement upon the evidence, which is so pathetically deprecated as leading to all sorts of confusion. If I deem the evidence invalid, I must, as a rational being, withhold my belief. The right of private judgement is not opposed to the authority of evidence, but to believing without sufficient evidence, upon suspicious evidence, and when higher evidence is to be had. It would be just as proper to represent the right of private judgement as illegitimately exercised in investigating the authority of Hume or Clarendon as an historian, as to deny the individual right of freely investigating the authority which calls itself the Church. Our only reason for rejecting as Protestants, the authority of the Church of Rome, is, that it is the evidence of a lying witness, a convicted falsifier of history and corrupter of the truth.

In ascertaining the true interpretation of Scripture, the opinions of the early fathers must be allowed the weight of historic evidence, as proving how the passages in question were understood by those who could not fail to arrive at the true meaning of the inspired writers. And had we not the record itself, it would be matter for thankfulness, that we have their opinion about its sacred contents. But no man in his senses would rest contented with an opinion about a record, when he might inspect the record itself. Were its terms doubtful, he would gladly avail himself of a glossary or comment; but it would be for the sake of comparing that comment with the text, and of forming his own opinion by its aid. But it is this act of conscientious reference to the inspired volume, as the only ultimate rule of faith to every individual, which Mr. Faber, Mr. Rose, and Mr. Maguire agree in denouncing as fraught with all sorts of mischief. And what is their argument? That the party examining the record for himself may, if he deviate from the comment, misunderstand and misinterpret some pas-

sages of the original. If so, it is at his own peril, and he must take the consequence.

Mr. Faber makes an important admission, however, when he observes, that we should 'introduce a universal scepticism,' were we to 'deny the right of forming a private judgement upon perfectly unambiguous propositions. No authoritative 'explanation', he adds, 'can throw any additional light upon 'the several prohibitions of murder and theft which occur in 'Holy Scripture.' That is to say, when a thing is certain and self-evident, we do not require the aid of testimony to prove it; nor, when it is clear and unambiguous, do we need any one to make it plainer. But the moment that a thing becomes ambiguous and uncertain, then the right of judgement ceases, and implicit faith begins. As soon as evidence fails us, we must immediately, to save ourselves from the penalty of doubt, surrender our judgement to the guidance of Authority, as children cling closer to their nurse in the dark. Suppose we were to admit, for argument's sake, that, while private judgement is to guide us in the day-light, Authority ought to take us by the hand in the dark; must we not be allowed to decide whether we can see clearly enough by the lamp of God to find our own way? If private judgement may be legitimately exercised upon unambiguous propositions, must it not be left to determine what are so? The Church of Rome, however, first creates the darkness in which she would involve us, by extinguishing the true light, and then bids us to follow her. As a pretext for imposing fetters upon the conscience, she takes away the means of knowledge, gives us her own decisions in the place of evidence, and thus opens a way, as Mr. Faber remarks, for universal scepticism.

If the judgement may be legitimately exercised upon unambiguous propositions, we do not see what is to deprive it of the right of exercising itself upon ambiguous ones. This, we leave Mr. Faber to explain. His admission, however, is quite sufficient for our purpose. Let us be allowed only the right of private judgement as to what is unambiguous in Scripture, and we shall be satisfied. Would Mr. Faber charge the word of his Saviour with ambiguity? Is there a single proposition in the word of God, which it concerns sinful man to understand as the ground of his hope or the rule of his life, that can be styled ambiguous? Will Mr. Faber turn apologist for Socinianism and every other unscriptural error, by imputing it to the ambiguity of God's word? Either the divinity of Christ, the doctrine of salvation through faith in His blood, and of sanctification by the Holy Spirit, are unambiguously revealed in the sacred Scriptures, or they are not. If the former, they are

points within the range of private judgement, according to Mr. Faber's own shewing; as much so as the unlawfulness of theft and murder; and to deny that private judgement may be legitimately exercised upon their import, is to exclude them from the class of certainties, and to open the door to scepticism. In fact, to insist upon the necessity of authority as over-ruling private judgement in matters of faith, is to deny that private judgement has sufficient evidence for its guidance, and thus to strike at the sufficiency of the Scriptures as a rule of faith.

'If you will stand to your rule', says Chillingworth, 'that Scripture is as perfect a rule of faith as a writing can be; you must then grant it so complete that it needs no addition, and so evident that it needs no interpretation; for both these properties are requisite to a perfect rule, and a writing is capable of both these properties.' Again: 'When you say that unlearned and ignorant men cannot understand Scripture, I would desire you to come out of the clouds, and tell us what you mean; whether that they cannot understand *all* Scripture, or that they cannot understand *any* Scripture, or that they cannot understand so much as is sufficient for their direction to heaven. If the first, I believe the learned are in the same case. If the second, every man's experience will confute you; for who is there that is not capable of a sufficient understanding of the story, the precepts, the promises, and the threats of the Gospel? If the third, that they may understand something, but not enough for their salvation; why doth St. Paul say to Timothy, the Scriptures are able to make him wise unto salvation?'

The injudicious and erroneous concessions of churchmen have indeed been the source of far greater mischief than all the aberrations of private judgement. They have done much to weaken the evidence of the truth, and have afforded a specious argument and a miserable triumph to the Papist on the one hand, and to the Infidel on the other. In order to bolster up the authority of their church, they have sacrilegiously detracted from the honours of Revelation, by denying the intelligibility of Scripture without the aid of tradition. Thus, attempts have been made to shew, that the doctrine of the Trinity, the obligation of the sabbath, the law of Baptism, and the inspiration of the Scriptures themselves, rest upon the same human authority as the divine right of episcopacy and the doctrine of purgatory; the insidious argument being intended, not to subvert the scriptural doctrines, by destroying their foundation,

* Religion of Protestants, p. 71.

but to consecrate the traditions of men by making them seem to stand upon the same footing. This stale and unhallowed artifice comports well enough with the policy of the Romanist; but the Protestant ought to be ashamed to have recourse to it. If any Trinitarians have confessed that the doctrine of the Trinity is founded, not on the Scriptures, but on the tradition of the Church, our answer to any argument founded on such admission by either Mr. Maguire or Dr. Drummond, is the same that Dr. Wardlaw returned to Mr. Yates: 'If *any* Trinitarians made such a concession, they were fools for their pains, and traitors to their cause.'*

Dr. Drummond has chosen to construct his title-page in the form of a calumny and an insult, on the authority of a Popish priest and a Hindoo deist; and he has thus supplied us at once with the true measure of his fairness as a controvertist, and of the extent of his attainments. He politely tells us, that, 'an honest review of *any* composition of a Unitarian author by an orthodox critic, would be a strange anomaly in the history of criticism'; and that 'every man who writes in support of Unitarianism, may be almost certain of having not only his literary and religious, but his moral character assailed and calumniated by *Calvinism*.' Such scandalous assertions come with peculiar grace from the Author of a pamphlet, which is from beginning to end a daringly dishonest misrepresentation of the orthodox doctrine, and a calumnious attack upon the understanding of all who hold it. We shall assuredly not waste the time of our readers by reviewing this Essay, which is as disgusting for its flippancy as it is contemptible in argument. Its assertions and criticisms have been a thousand times amply met, and triumphantly refuted, of which it suits the Author to take no notice. Unitarianism, as it calls itself, is no new thing, unfortunately, in Ireland. In Dublin itself, more than a century ago, it met with its refutation and exposure from the able pen of the learned Joseph Boyce, whose 'Vindication of the True Deity of Our Blessed Saviour,' deserves to be better known. A large portion of Dr. Drummond's second-hand sophisms and bald assertions have, by anticipation, been canvassed in our own pages; and as he informs us, that all the arguments hitherto arrayed against his doctrine are 'thin and vapoury, and of no consistence,' it would be only degrading to ourselves and useless to our readers, to enter into controversy with an individual so impreguably intrenched in his own good opinion. In this land of liberty, nevertheless, we fully concede

* Wardlaw's Reply to Yates, p. 25.

to him an equal and undoubted right to defend his religious opinions; and as he has shewn himself to be proof against the authority of scriptural evidence, there is no other authority by which we could hope to convince or wish to restrain him, but that which struck Saul of Damascus to the ground, and changed the blasphemer into a believer.

The case of the Socinian, however, we have seen, is adduced by the fautors of tradition as an authoritative interpreter, against the Protestant doctrine of the right of private judgement, as a striking illustration of its dangerous result. Mr. Rose ascribes the infidelity and neologism of the continental churches to the adoption of this fundamental principle of the Reformation; and Mr. Lingard, the Romish historian, asserts, that Unitarians are, of all Protestants, the most consistent, and carry the principles of the Reformation to their fullest extent. The Unitarians accept the compliment, although not intended as such; and the shallow misrepresentation is echoed back to the Papist as a Protestant concession. Let us then examine it a little more closely.

The fundamental principle of the Reformation is undeniably, the sufficiency and exclusive authority of the Holy Scriptures, as the sole standard of faith, and the consequent right of individual appeal to that standard. What has been the result of the Reformation founded upon this principle? The Bible, having come to be regarded as the true fountain of religion, has been rescued from its imprisonment in the cells of monks, and has been sent through the world in every language of Christendom. After having been for long ages withheld from the people as a dangerous and scarcely intelligible volume, it is now in the hands of every Protestant peasant, who finds that the testimony of the Lord is plain and sure, 'making wise the simple.' Now if this principle, or this proceeding, tends to generate Socinianism, it must be because the reading of the Bible tends to make men Socinians; a position so revolting, that even the Romanist must, one would think, fear to maintain it, and which is sufficiently disproved by fact and experience. Yet, it is broadly alleged, and that by Protestant clergymen, that uninstructed persons reading the Bible for themselves, and judging of its contents for themselves, must inevitably be led to form, owing to the variety of men's minds, all sorts of opinions; and that this has been the occasion of multiplied heresies, schisms, and absurdities. The proper and complete reply to this hypothetical argument, is an appeal to facts. Or, if it be asserted that such is the fact, that the unrestricted circulation of the Holy Scriptures has led to the multiplication of errors and heresies, we meet such assertion with

an explicit denial, and join issue upon this question. Let the Romanists rake up all the names of Protestant sects that he can collect, with the help of Evans's Sketch, sects existent or non-existent, that have sprung up in the Church since the Reformation, in those countries where the Holy Scriptures have been circulated; and we will engage to produce a catalogue quite as long, and exhibiting aberrations quite as ridiculous or melancholy, that had their birth in the golden age of the Church of Rome, before the art of printing had been invented, or the morning star of the Reformation had risen above the horizon. We will undertake to prove, that heresies and schisms have never been multiplied, except in the destitution of the Holy Scriptures, and where the community have not had access to them; and that the Protestant Church has always been more truly united in doctrine, notwithstanding the absence of outward uniformity, than the pseudo-Catholic Church. The Holy Scriptures, which are falsely represented as occasioning the variety of religious opinions, furnish the only remedy for that evil; and it is found by experience, that in proportion as they are freely circulated, heresies give way, differences are softened down, and truth, left to its proper evidence, finds its way to the understanding and the heart.

The causes which have led to the increase of infidelity on the Continent, (or we should rather say, to the new disguise which it has there assumed,) have been treated at length so recently in our pages,* that we shall not now enter further into the subject; but shall content ourselves with remarking, that the return to better principles and more scriptural doctrines, which is extensively taking place, is attributable to nothing so much as the increased circulation of the Holy Scriptures in those countries among all classes of the community. Dr. Drummond tells us, that 'abroad, Unitarianism is spreading like the light of heaven. The mountains and valleys of Switzerland are re-echoing her hallelujahs, while Malan and his fanatics are howling a funeral dirge over the lifeless case of Calvinism.' We can inform him that Unitarianism is *not* spreading; but that the doctrines of the Reformation, blessed be God, are regaining their ascendancy.

The error of the Socinian, which has been so ignorantly or so malignantly confounded with the Protestant principle, consists, not in his exercising the independent right of private judgement, which is his unquestionable birthright, but in his refusing to bow to the evidence which the Word of God supplies, with

* Eclectic Rev. July, 1827. Art. *German Neologism.*

regard to the truths that he impugns. He brings to the Holy Scriptures the prejudices of an unbeliever, and he wrests the Scripture in order to countenance his unbelief. He rejects that sufficient evidence of the truth which God has been pleased to vouchsafe, and in our acceptance or rejection of which, an important part of our moral probation consists; and it is absurd to suppose that any human testimony could compel his belief. No authorized interpretation of the Scripture can have attaching to it that evidence of its truth, which belongs to the infallible dictates of inspiration; and he who refuses to believe on the authority of St. Paul and St. John, can hardly be expected to believe on the fallible testimony of Ignatius or Justin. We are far from commending the Socinian for rejecting the lower species of evidence which is supplied by the historic testimony of the Church; but his rejecting it, is but the consequence of his resisting the Divine testimony contained in the clear and simple declarations of Scripture. To believe or not to believe, to obey or not to obey, to choose good or evil, God has put into the power of every one; and on the right exercise of this inalienable and awful prerogative, our salvation depends. The exercise of private judgement in the choice of our religion, Mr. Faber himself allows; and the Romanist appeals to this private judgement in insisting upon the claims of his church; but both, strange to say, refuse to allow, that the legitimate, probationary exercise of the judgement and conscience can have for its proper object, the revelation which God has given to man, the witness which he hath testified of his Son, and the message of his grace.

The length to which this article has already extended, will not allow of our entering upon any fresh topic; or it would be profitable to look a little more closely into the claims of the self-constituted depository of that authority which is supposed to supersede the exercise of private judgement in all doubtful matters. On this point, Mr. Faber and the Bishop of Aire would not accord. Though agreeing to treat private judgement as their common enemy, theirs is by no means a common cause. On some future occasion, this subject may come more distinctly before us. In the mean time, we must remark, that, while both the Romanist and the Semi-Protestant contend for the necessity of an authorized interpreter of Scripture, and respectively put in their claim on behalf of that which they deem the true church, they will be found to differ most essentially as to the real *organ* of that authority which is supposed to be so necessary a check and restraint upon private judgement. The authority which the Church-of-England-man contends for, is at least defined and intelligible, being embodied in

the form of creeds and articles, and tied down by them, so that it cannot trench any further upon the right of private judgement,—cannot extend its jurisdiction over the conscience. The organ of that authority is in effect the State. It is otherwise with the mysterious, indefinite, all-pervading authority of the Romish Church. ‘The matter in truth’, remarks Mr. Pope, ‘resolves itself into this: that the priest is the *infallible* organ of the Church in the estimation of the people.’ Mr. Maguire endeavours to parry off this remark by saying, that ‘the priest is the organ of infallibility, as long as he teaches the true doctrine of the Catholic Church.’ His teaching the truth, however, would only make him the organ of truth: he is the organ of infallibility, because he is invested, in the eyes of the people, with an authority over their consciences which pretends to be infallible. Whether he teaches the true doctrine of his Church or not, the people have no means of ascertaining, nor are they permitted to decide. To him, to the Holy Church in his person, they are bound implicitly to surrender their minds. It is thus, as we have shewn on a former occasion, that the Church of Rome is not only the *author*, but the *object* of that faith which it demands from its votaries, and that not simply as an abstract object, or as a political authority. The Church of Rome, that is to say, the spiritual power pretended to by that Church, and vested in the person of every priest, is as truly the ultimate object of faith to every consistent Romanist, as Christ is the object of faith to every true Christian. Upon the power of the priest hinges the whole system of Popery,—that plenary authority flowing down from its infallible head, ‘Our Lord God the Pope,’ to every ordained divinity in the Romish priesthood; by virtue of which they transubstantiate, absolve from sin, vend indulgences, dispense grace, loose from the pains of hell, and confer eternal life. Transubstantiation, Purgatory, Confession, Indulgences, the four pillars of Popery, rest upon the common foundation of this ghostly authority, of which the Pope is the chief corner-stone. It is from *this* authority, that, in the exercise, not of a mere right, but of a bounden duty, Protestants appeal to the Word of God. Against this authority we protest *in toto*, whether claimed by Papist or Protestant; in every disguise which it may assume; whether dominant and avowed, as in the Romish Church, or lurking in the dark places of the English service-book. The ‘boast and base’ of the Reformation consisted in the overthrow of this spiritual authority, in order to make way for the Bible only, and the right of private judgement in matters of faith upon the authority of the Bible, as the foundation of the religion of Protestants. We rejoice that after all, though Mr.

Faber seems, in common with many of his class, to disavow that principle, owing to a mistaken view of it, yet, when he comes to grapple more closely with Popery towards the close of the volume, he makes the noble avowal, worthy of a Protestant clergyman—‘MAN, FOR HIS RELIGIOUS OPINIONS, IS ANSWERABLE TO GOD ALONE.’

We shall have further occasion to advert to the contents both of Mr. Faber's work and of Mr. Mendham's volume, which we have left ourselves no room to notice. They contain much curious and valuable information, and we recommend them to the attention of our readers. We shall be happy to think, that we have, in the present article, contributed in any humble measure to vindicate that great principle which seems to be so little understood, and which even the antagonists of Popery seem ready to abandon.

Art. II.—1. *Death-bed Scenes, and Pastoral Conversations.* By the late John Warton, D.D. Edited by his Sons. Two Vols. 8vo. pp. 1046. Price 24s. London, 1826, 1827.

2. *Sermons and Miscellaneous Pieces.* By the Rev. Robert Wynell Mayow. 12mo. pp. 453. Price 7s. 6d. London, 1821.

THERE is no circumstance of a pastor's duty, that makes a greater demand on his discretion, than the adaptation of his ministerial offices to the condition of the dying. An awful responsibility surrounds him at all times; but, in these seasons, it besets him with anxieties and difficulties of the most harassing and oppressive nature. Where the thread of life is straining upon its last fibre, it seems the very act of desperation, to throw the pressure of a burdened conscience upon its yielding strength, and thus to give a termination assuredly fatal to the strife which as yet is in suspense. Nevertheless, since there is something infinitely beyond the interests of an earthly existence, that turns upon the mere point of time which is thus given, it would be guilt and madness to pause upon the hazard. It becomes then a most important question, whether there is no medium between an abrupt disclosure of danger, and a criminal attempt at concealing or palliating it; between a violent appeal to a sleeping conscience, and a heartless prophecy of smooth things. Such a medium will, we believe, always present itself, even in the most difficult cases; nor will it be otherwise than easily found, by the man who, in a spirit of mingled tenderness and fidelity, endeavours to make the patient acquainted with himself, his condition, his danger, and his refuge. Although to probe a deep wound must of necessity

be painful, the pain itself will be salutary when it is known to be remedial; and when the disease and the cure, the curse and the promise, sin and the Sanctifier, condemnation and the Saviour, are placed before the dying criminal in their right bearing and aspect, we are sure that the effect must be, in every way, for good, and not for evil. At the same time, it is not to be concealed, that, in a matter of such peculiar delicacy, there is danger of error; nor is there any line of pastoral service, in which it is more desirable to be in full possession of all the knowledge that personal circumstances and the experience of others can suggest.

The volumes before us will not supply that knowledge. They are blind and halting guides, leading to lame and impotent conclusions. Concerning the history of the first, we know nothing but from the information afforded by the preface; and we confess that we have strong misgivings respecting its correctness. It is there stated, as from the Author himself, that the 'scenery'—meaning, we suppose, the details and personages—of the work, is 'strictly conformable to truth and nature.' The dialogue, moreover, is affirmed to be substantially the transcript of what actually passed between the Writer and certain individuals whom he was called on to visit in the discharge of his professional duties. We have, from the Editors, the further intimation, that, although it is judged expedient to conceal the name and situation of the parish where the Author resided, it was not thought necessary to withhold his name, '*because it is so common*'. Now, we apprehend that, admitting Warton to be a much more frequently occurring surname than we should, from our own observation, have supposed, we shall still have room to ask, how such a reason can be made applicable to the present business. There are not, we imagine, so many *John Wartons, D.D.*, in the situation of rector over a parish in the immediate neighbourhood of a large town and a navigable river, but that a reference to the Clerical Guide of a few years back, would give the desired information to any one who might wish to acquire it. In addition to this, the book itself has all the appearance of an artificial composition, got up for specific purposes, and arranged with special regard to effect. The 'scenes' may have occurred, certainly; but they strike us as being suspiciously *scenic*. The 'conversations' may be natural; but, in our view, they are palpably *dramatic*. The 'histories' may be verity itself; but with us, they savour strongly of *romance*. They have, at all events, an obvious design. They take a ground which is, in our opinion, most weak and dangerous, while there is an anxious and elaborate adjustment of circumstantialities to the principles thus injuriously

assumed. What are usually termed 'evangelical' sentiments, are exhibited in a light both unfavourable and unfair; while the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, and its high-church collaterals, are strenuously maintained. The points which stand forward most prominently, are far from being those which we should deem the best suited to the exigencies of a dying hour; nor are they presented in what appears to us their scriptural form. It is not always easy to give a precise definition of error; and we feel it the more difficult in the present instance, since our objections are not so much to what is actually said, as to the way in which it is expressed; to the want of due adjustment and subordination, rather than to any absolute perversion of gospel truth. We have no quarrel with the Writer on the subject of the 'meeting-house'; nor shall we accuse him of either an ignorant or a malignant antipathy to those whom he may deem sectarians. This is a matter which, so far as we are concerned, he is very much at liberty to settle with his own judgement and conscience, and then to make the award of bigotry or liberality as it may please him. But the treatment of the dying is a higher concern; and while there is one, and but one, system of safe and effectual medication, we can never consent to give them up to experiment or charlatanism. The regimen is simple,—*repentance towards God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ*;—a deep and humble sense of the exceeding sinfulness of sin, with a heartfelt application to Him who died for sinners. Concerning penitence, there is much said, though not always efficiently, in the volumes before us. Of faith, as the turning-point of salvation, we have comparatively little, nor is that little satisfactorily stated.

'The Prayer-Book, out of which I had read the Psalm, being prefixed to the Bible, I turned to the seventh chapter of Saint Luke's Gospel, and rose from my knees, and said, "I will now read you a beautiful story out of the New Testament, that you may see more clearly and certainly, what a mighty power the broken and contrite spirit has with God, through the intercession of our blessed Saviour and Redeemer Jesus Christ."

'She bowed her head at the sacred name of *him*, before whom hereafter every knee shall bow, either in holy adoration, or in hopeless despair. I rejoiced to have thus discovered that she knew him, and I secretly prayed for time to make her acquainted with the all-sufficiency of his merits to atone for the sins of the whole race of mankind.

'However, standing by the bed-side (for there was no chair at liberty) I began at the 26th verse, and read to the end of the chapter; intermixing a few explanations and remarks, as I went on, applicable to her own case. For instance: "the Pharisees," I said, "were proud of their good deeds, or of what they thought to be

good deeds, and fancied themselves God's especial favourites; and despised and condemned all others, as wicked and reprobates, who lived in a different manner from themselves. But no deed is good enough in God's sight to claim a reward of *him*. In all we do, we fall short, in some way or other; the very best of us fall short of true goodness. We must, therefore, humble ourselves before God, instead of boasting of any merit that we might seem to have; and we must look to the merits of Christ, and plead *them* only in our behalf. Such is the disposition that God and Christ love; and such are the persons whom Christ was sent to seek and to save. These self-sufficient Pharisees, therefore, did not profit by him, because they imagined that they did not want him. The sick only call for the great Physician of souls; but *they* vainly thought themselves whole, and so they rejected him with scorn. The very harlots went into the kingdom of God, but *they* would not believe or receive him, and so they died in their sins." When I had finished the chapter, she said, "Oh! that I could hear those blessed words, 'Go in peace, thy sins are forgiven!' then I should be happy indeed, and wish God to take me. But the sins of that poor woman could never have been so great as mine; nor am I, I fear, so penitent as she was." "Pray to God, then," I replied, "to make you so; and as to the greatness of her sins, no doubt they were very great; but it is not necessary to know how great they were, nor to compare our own with hers. God has nothing to do with much or little in such a case; but, at all events, they that love him much, will be forgiven much. This is the Gospel, and these, I hope, are glad tidings to you." "Glad indeed," she said: "and I will think of nothing else; and I will try to love my Maker and my Redeemer, that they may love *me* in return, and save my soul."

'In this propitious frame of mind I left her for the present, having first kneeled again, and repeated the Lord's prayer, and the first prayer in the office for the visitation of the sick, and the benediction at the end. As I got up to take leave of her, and went out of the room, she eagerly besought me to call again soon, and to pray for her in the Church.'

* * * * *

'The name of Jesus was not new to her, as it was to many whom I was summoned to visit on their death-beds. She knew to whom the sinner in general might fly for pardon, although she did not seem to know the whole extent of the mercy of the Gospel, and thought perhaps that she herself might be excluded from it. Upon being told, therefore, that God's mercy through Christ was bounded by no limits, and perfectly universal, she was prepared and stimulated to love much, with the hope of having much forgiven. Nor was it necessary that I should now teach her the great principles of right and wrong, in order that she might examine and scrutinize her actions, with a view to a thorough repentance; a long sickness, and the approach of death, having torn asunder the veil which licentious passion had thrown over such actions, she now saw them in all their deformity and wickedness as they had been long ago described to

her in the days of her former innocence ; conscience had regained its just influence, and stung her thoughts with a severe retribution of anguish ; and she was herself more inclined to exaggerate, than to extenuate, every sin or folly of which she had been guilty.'

This is a favourable specimen, but it will enable our readers to see how extremely crude and inadequate are the Writer's views and applications. Making just so much of an advance towards truth, as to give a specious and trust-worthy air to what is really vague and delusive, such representations are more dangerous than even grosser violations of evangelical simplicity. Evasion is often more mischievous than contradiction ; and the paragraphs we have cited, may serve to shew how near an approach may be made to Divine truth, without entering upon that full and adequate exposition which alone can be justly considered as applicable to the exigencies of man. For the rest, the work is not without evidences of talent, although not of an exalted order. It is rather interesting ; and amid much superficial reasoning and bald divinity, there will be found occasional intimations of better feeling, and hints of higher capabilities.

Even without the slight and apparently careless reference made in the preface, we should have had no difficulty in assigning the origin of 'Death-bed Scenes,' to the *ideal* suggested by the smaller volume before us ; which we have been for some time looking for an opportunity of noticing, without laying ourselves under the necessity of dealing with it in the way of regular and protracted criticism ;—a formal courtesy to which its value by no means entitles it, though there are circumstances connected with its Author of a very interesting kind. Mayow was neither a profound nor a safe divine. He had not even the merit of originality in his singularities, for he was a feeble copyist of William Law ; but he was a man of sustained enthusiasm, his feelings were intense, his devotedness to his work was disinterested and unremitting, and his honest anxiety to do good, gives an attractiveness to his character which its intellectual qualities fail to command.

Robert Wynnell Mayow was born at Saltash, in 1777. He gave early indications both of mental activity and decided character. His first destination was to the law ; but this was soon abandoned for the pulpit, and in 1801, after the regular college course, he took orders.

'From an early period of his life, he was utterly regardless of fatigue, personal danger, or risk of contagious disease, when in pursuit of a charitable object. One striking instance of this predominant principle of charity may be given, which occurred in 1802.

In a very hot evening of the summer of 1802, Mr. Mayow being in London with his mother and sister in lodgings in Grenville Street, and sitting late in the evening, just as it was dusk, a man dressed in shabby but not ragged mourning, appeared leading a child on the opposite side of the street; he stopped and held his hat in an attitude of supplication. Mr. M. came down to the door and beckoned the man across the way; he told a piteous tale, that he had been thrown out of employment by illness, and that he had a wife and children at that moment perishing from want and disease. Mr. Mayow followed the suppliant a considerable distance into Westminster; his guide took him into one court, through another, and through houses, not apparently a thoroughfare, into inner courts, and finally up a dark winding staircase, where, as he afterwards confessed, he began to feel some degree of not unreasonable apprehension. The man's story was true; the man opened a door, and at the foot of a bed so close to the door that it would hardly open (from the smallness of the room), sat a woman, with the small-pox out upon her, suckling an infant in the same disease. The frightful nakedness, filth, and haggard misery, with hair hanging about her neck, exceeded any thing he ever saw before. There were other sick children in the room and bed, whom he could scarcely at first distinguish in the dusk. The horror of the scene surpassed all he had before witnessed; the woman gave a look as if she expected some harm, probably from surprise. On Mr. M.'s return to his friends, he told the story; he did not enlarge upon what he had done to relieve this distressed family, but, from the cheerfulness of his countenance and manner, there could be no doubt he had made their hearts glad.

In his pastoral relation, this excellent man was most exemplary. He gave liberally and personally; sometimes to his own inconvenience. Food, clothing, money, advice, consolation, were always ready for the distressed; nor was distance or untimely application allowed to interfere with the exercise of his duty in its largest and most benevolent construction. He was self-denying and abstemious; fasting frequently, and using wine only as medicine. His preaching appears to have been attractive; and this we can readily conceive, inasmuch as his sermons are not a little whimsical in their construction; short, sententious, 'full of wise saws and modern instances,' and strangely interlarded with delineations of character after the manner of La Bruyere and Law. *Lingua*, *Emporus*, *Millio*, *Prospero*, and a dozen other intangible beings, with out-of-the-way names, dance through his sermons like the gay transparencies of a phantasmagoria, and with, we should imagine, as little lasting impression. How skilfully soever this sort of illustrative composition may have been managed by Law, it is intolerable at second-hand; and although, in a hortatory treatise, it may have been sufficiently in place, in a pulpit address it has

an exceedingly flippant and undignified air. As an auxiliary to reasoning and expostulation, this method is miserably ineffective: as a substitute for them, it is mischievous and offensive. What should we think of one of our popular preachers who should interrupt his admonitions, to amuse his hearers with such trash as the following?

‘*Lingua* is a woman who is always giving her opinion of every body she sees. She laughs at *one* man, because his *hair is too short*;—at another, because his *face is too thin*;—at another, because he is *too good*; she cannot *bear* any one so much better than his neighbours.’

Yet, such was the style in which Mayow systematically indulged, and with which his volume, entitled ‘*Plain Preaching*,’ published (the second edition) in 1816, is charged *ad nauseam*. He seems, moreover, to have been far from clear on some important points of Christian doctrine. He admits that Christ is God, ‘in the fullest sense of the word,’ but seems, at the same time, to believe in something more than his official subordination. He tries to explain his peculiar notions of the Divine subsistence after the following fashion, which, if any of our readers shall be able to understand, he will be more fortunate than we have been. God, he says,

‘is not local, but infinite and universal, and, if I may so speak, not capable of being seen except by a representative; and this representative is by St. Paul called his image; and that image is his Son Jesus Christ, differing from the Father inasmuch as he is local; but being God himself, as much as God is capable of being local.’

‘Our Saviour says—“He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father.” I therefore conclude, that he is the image of the invisible Father. In him dwelt all the fullness of the Godhead bodily. God was in him reconciling the world to himself. These expressions convince me that he is the local being, or concentration of the Deity.’

He denies the doctrine of satisfaction in such a way as to give reason to suppose that, in his theological investigations, he did not stop to make himself acquainted with the meaning of words.

‘I am clearly of opinion that Jesus Christ did not die to satisfy God’s justice; for I am sure that our Lord’s death could be no satisfaction to God in any way. It was the greatest sacrifice God could make, and God could feel no more satisfaction in it than you could feel if you were obliged to sacrifice your son. It is, I think, therefore, self-evident, that as the great sacrifice of our Lord’s death produced no effect on God but a painful one, all the advantages which result from that sacrifice, must be sought for in the effects which it produces in *us*.’

He then resolves these 'effects' into gratitude.

'A degree of gratitude which no words can describe ; a degree of gratitude which we could never have felt, if our pardon had been granted without any sacrifice at all.'

He goes on to wade still deeper in this slough of absurdity, by intimating, 'that this degree of gratitude is necessary to 'preserve our everlasting love and obedience.' We have met with various opponencies and incongruities in the course of our critical and polemical career ; but more unresisting imbecility than this, it was never our lot to encounter. It is enough to say of this wild notion, that it contradicts, not only the clear dictate of Scripture, but the great and primary law of God's universal operations—to effect all ends by the simplest means ; to accomplish the highest designs by instrumentalities apparently inadequate ; but never to employ lofty agencies on inadequate designs. This is his prerogative, the signature of his dealings with mankind ; and it would have been in utter violation of it, to employ the transcendently glorious machinery of Redemption, for the mere purpose of securing, through the precarious influence of grateful feeling, man's 'everlasting love and obedience.'

With all this injurious tendency to erroneous and superficial statement, there is something about Mayow's writings, as about himself, that awakens a deep interest in the man. He had fallen, we fear, into bad hands as intimates and counsellors ; and we trust and believe that, notwithstanding his shallow theology, his misty argumentation, and his imperfect views, he had a dying grasp of the Altar which he dimly saw ; a saving faith in the Victim whose work he depreciated, and whose person, though he loved, he saw through a glass darkly.

As an illustration, both of the sort of obligation that the Author of 'Death-bed Scenes' owes to Mayow's book, and with a further view to the demonstration of the utter inadequacy of any thing less than a full exhibition of the great evil and the grand remedy, when death calls on us for faithful dealing, we give the following example of miserable trifling with the exigencies of a dying hour. Mayow might be, if such a character there can be, a conscientious trifler ; but a trifler he was, and a most dangerous one.

'I took my bundle under my arm, and was going home, having quite forgotten poor old Samuel Grey. However, his niece soon called me back, and I went into the next house. I went up stairs into the room where the old man was lying. He was panting for breath, his face red, his beard long.

'He said, he was very poorly ; that he was taken ill not more than

a week ago, that he was seventy-two, and that he did not expect to get better.

‘He seemed to be more afraid of death, and more anxious I should pray for him, than any person I ever saw in his situation.

‘I gave him all the comfort I could. We prayed. We had not been praying long, before I heard a knock at the door. I thought it was the doctor, and so it was. I went down, and desired him to come up stairs.

* * * * *

‘When the doctor was gone, Patty, the old man’s daughter, said, “Sir, if you please, my father wishes to receive the Sacrament.”

“Does he,” said I, “you should have told me of this before.” Be not you weary of your duty, Robert, thought I.

* * * * *

‘We returned to his room.

‘He was still panting for breath. He opened his eyes when he heard us coming into the room. He held out his hand to me—it trembled and shook like a leaf. He did not speak. I put my hand in his—it was as hot as fire.

‘When I looked at the helpless old man, I said to myself, If you were in his situation, Robert, helpless, old, dying, reproved by your friends, and afraid of God, how much would you wish to find any one who would have pity on you, and speak to you with kindness; therefore, be you such an one to this old man. So I will, thought I, but do not let me injure him with my kindness.

‘I said to him, “My good friend, when people are in your situation, they very often say, that they have done no harm; but this is not right; we should confess our sins, and then God will forgive us if we repent. God loves us, and Jesus Christ died to save us from our sins.”

“I do repent, sir; I will repent; I do repent, sir, as well as ever I am able.”

“Then you can do no more; and God has promised to forgive them who do repent; I cannot forgive you, but I will pray to God that he may.”

“God bless you, sir, and thank you.”

‘The poor old man was so much comforted, that his spirit seemed to revive, and he was at a loss for words to express how much he thanked me.

‘The next time I saw him, he was better, and his niece said to me, “The doctor says, sir, that he has hopes of him.”

‘However, he did not get any better, and, in three or four days time, he was as bad as ever he had been.

‘Never did I see any one so glad to see me, and so thankful, as this old man.

“Have you anything,” said I, “any thing on your conscience that you would wish to say to me? If you have, I am willing to hear it; and the Scriptures tell us to confess our sins to one another, for our comfort and benefit, but I do not know that they command us.”

‘However I do not think that he made any answer. I believe he made none.

‘The next night, his niece desired me to ask him the same question.

‘And so I did. He replied, “Sir, I do not know; I have sometimes taken too much of drink, and then I have come out with bad words; that is all.”

‘“May God forgive you,” said I, “and bless you. You must be humble before God, and you must forgive all those who have done you any harm.”

‘“Yes, sir; I must, I know I must.”

‘“Do you wish to recover?”

‘“No, sir; I have delivered myself up to God. I am an old man, and I am in the way. When I am well, I am lame, and can get but little but what people choose to give me; and when a labouring man is past his work, he is in the way; and the sooner he is dead, the better: I always think so, sir.”

‘The old man’s submission went to my heart.

‘“I will not think of this world any more, sir; if I were a rich man, sir, it would be a different thing. I should then have something to live upon, and that I should not like to leave; but now, sir, I have nothing to live for, and it is better as it is.”’

Ardwick, near Manchester, was the last scene of Mayow’s labours. He met his death in his work, and in his last sickness, expressed his submission to the will of God, his reliance on the Redeemer. ‘The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ,’ was his emphatic application of the words of the communion service, while he was taking a little wine medicinally, ‘which was shed for me, preserve my body and soul to everlasting life: I drink this cup in remembrance that Christ’s blood was shed for me, and am thankful.’ He died at the early age of thirty-nine, January 8, 1817.

Art. III. *A History of the Life and Voyages of Christopher Columbus*. By Washington Irving. In 4 vols. 8vo. pp. 1865. Price 2l. 2s. London. 1828.

THE fifteenth century is justly distinguished by Mr. Irving as ‘the most splendid era of invention in the annals of the world.’ There had been before, as there have been since, periods in which the mental and physical energies of man were called into sudden and successful action, by the influence of extraordinary and co-operating causes; but there does not appear, on the records of time, any memorial of a season at once so productive of great discoveries, so fortunate in the revival of the well-nigh lost and forgotten knowledge of the past, and so influential on the character and destinies of mankind, in the ages that were to follow. In nothing was this general movement more remarkable, than in its tendency to-

ward maritime discovery. The revival of letters had brought into notice the works of the ancient geographers, and the labours of the Arabian mathematicians were finding their way into the schools and colleges of Europe.

‘The knowledge thus reviving, was but limited and imperfect; yet, like the return of morning light, it was full of interest and beauty. It seemed to call a new creation into existence, and broke, with all the charm of wonder, upon imaginative minds. They were surprised at their own ignorance of the world around them. Every step seemed discovery, for every region beyond their native country was in a manner *terra incognita*.’

Among the inhabitants of the maritime cities of Italy, these bright intimations of science and discovery, and the yet more dazzling speculations to which they gave origin, would awake a peculiar interest, and excite a proportionate eagerness of pursuit. Many an ardent spirit would look around for fortunate occurrences, and long for opportunities of launching forth on that mighty ocean which offered an easy access to the ‘wealth of Ormuz and of Ind’, to the region of gold and gems, of spices and perfumes. There is, however, a wide intellectual interval between the restless who seek occasions, and the resolute who make them; between the daring follower who acts with energy and skill on suggested plans, and the high-minded leader who forecasts, combines, and directs. Of the former class, Italy was full: of the latter, there was but a single individual, and he had entered on life with an elementary and imperfect education, and with prospects not much beyond those of a seaman before the mast. This man was Columbus the Genoese, a wool-comber’s son, struggling with ardent hopes and narrow means; working, it is probable, for a season, at his father’s trade, and giving himself up to the casualties of a sailor’s life, at the early age of fourteen.

But we have no intention of giving an ‘abstract and brief chronicle’ of Columbus and his times. The tale is at once too long and intricate, and too pleasantly told in the volumes before us, to warrant our engaging in this work of supererogation. We might, indeed, seize on some point of doubtful statement or imperfect illustration, and by the help of a large display of authorities, dragged reluctantly along in the wake of an ostentatious hypothesis, make up a piquant article after the fashion of the day. But, for this gratuitous sort of labour we are not at all disposed, nor are the volumes in our hands provocative to such an inclination. Mr. Irving has exercised his accustomed tact in the management of his work. There is no affectation of research, though there has evidently been

a careful and extensive canvassing of original materials, and a diligent examination of illustrative documents. The Author visited Madrid for the purpose of collecting intelligence; and during his residence there, he enjoyed all the means of reference that could be afforded him by the liberality of the different parties to whom he had occasion to apply. He has, in his preface, expressly disclaimed all intention of making his narrative a text-book for 'speculations or general reflections'; and this abstinence has been carried to the extent of neglecting not a few points of great and general interest, admirably suited to his habits of thought and composition. On the whole, he has given the details of his story fully, put them together skilfully, and narrated them in a most attractive manner. It would be idle, on our parts, to give either an analysis or a lengthened review of a work which will, in one way or another, be speedily in every body's hands, and we shall therefore confine ourselves to such cursory references as may furnish sufficient indications of its general character. The personal introduction of the hero is well managed.

'The first trace we have of him in Spain, is in the testimony furnished, a few years after his death, in the celebrated lawsuit between his son Don Diego and the Crown, by Garcia Fernandez, a physician resident in the little sea-port of Palos de Moguer, in Andalusia. About half a league from that town stood, and stands at the present day, an ancient convent of Franciscan friars, dedicated to Santa Maria de Rabida. According to the testimony of the physician, a stranger on foot, accompanied by a young boy, stopped one day at the gate of the convent, and asked of the porter a little bread and water for his child. While receiving this humble refreshment, the prior of the convent, Friar Juan Perez de Marchena, happening to pass by, was struck with the appearance of the stranger; and, observing from his air and accent, that he was a foreigner, entered into conversation with him, and soon learnt the particulars of his story. That stranger was Columbus, accompanied by his young son Diego. Whence he had come, does not clearly appear; that he was in destitute circumstances, is evident from the mode of his way-faring; he was on his way to the neighbouring town of Huelva, to seek his brother-in-law, who had married a sister of his deceased wife.'

Notwithstanding the many and complicated difficulties with which, as an unfriended and high-spirited adventurer, he would have to contend, the circumstances of the times were, on the whole, favourable to Columbus. There was a stirring temper at work in men's bosoms; a persuasion that great inventions and events were at hand, and an intense eagerness to be among the foremost in seizing the golden opportunities that were crowding round. Kings were not slow to catch the enthusiasm; and although Ferdinand and Isabella, the joint sove-

reigns of Spain, were, at the moment, fully occupied with the Moorish war, Columbus succeeded in obtaining an audience from the first minister of the Crown, and access to the regal presence. The cold, crafty, and selfish Ferdinand is too favourably painted by Mr. Irving; but his character of Isabella of Castile is a lovely portraiture, and we dare not be ungallant enough to insinuate that this too may be somewhat overcharged*.

'She is one of the purest and most beautiful characters in the pages of history. She was well formed, of the middle size, with great dignity and gracefulness of deportment, and a mingled gravity and sweetness of demeanour. Her complexion was fair; her hair auburn, inclining to red; her eyes were of a clear blue, with a benign expression; and there was a singular modesty in her countenance, gracing, as it did, a wonderful firmness of purpose, and earnestness of spirit. Though strongly attached to her husband, and studious of his fame, yet she always maintained her distinct rights as an allied prince. She exceeded him in beauty, in personal dignity, in acuteness of genius, and in grandeur of soul. Combining the active and resolute qualities of man with the softer charities of woman, she mingled in the warlike councils of her husband, engaged personally in his enterprises, and, in some instances, surpassed him in the firmness and intrepidity of her measures;—while, being inspired with a truer idea of glory, she infused a more lofty and generous temper into his subtle and calculating policy. It is in the civil history of their reign, however, that the character of Isabella shines most illustrious. Her fostering and maternal care was continually directed to reform the laws, and heal the ills engendered by a long course of internal wars. She loved her people; and while diligently seeking their good, she mitigated, as much as possible, the harsh measures of her husband, directed to the same end, but inflamed by a mistaken zeal. Thus, though almost bigoted in her piety, and perhaps too much under the influence of ghostly advisers, still, she was hostile to every measure calculated to advance religion at the expense of humanity. She strenuously opposed the expulsion of the Jews, and the establishment of the Inquisition, though, unfortunately for Spain, her repugnance was slowly vanquished by her confessors. She was always an advocate for clemency to the Moors, although she was the soul of the war against Granada. She considered that war essential to protect the Christian faith, and to relieve her subjects from fierce and formidable enemies. While all her public thoughts and acts were princely and

* That a princess who was otherwise 'a model for sovereigns,' of gentle manners and generous mind, should be capable of lending her authority to the institution of such a tribunal as the Holy Office, affords, it has been well remarked, 'a most striking proof of the fatal influence which the papal theology exerts on even the sound portion of the Christian church.' This observation comes with emphasis from a pious Spaniard. See *Ecl. Rev.* vol. xvii. p. 118.

august, her private habits were simple, frugal, and unostentatious. In the intervals of state-business, she assembled round her the ablest men in literature and science, and directed herself by their counsels, in promoting letters and arts. Through her patronage, Salamanca rose to that height which it assumed among the learned institutions of the age. She promoted the distribution of honours and rewards for the promulgation of knowledge; she fostered the art of printing recently invented, and encouraged the establishment of presses in every part of the kingdom; books were admitted free of all duty, and more, we are told, were printed in Spain, at that early period of the art, than in the present literary age.'

Much talent is displayed in the description of the first voyage. Its uncertainties and despondencies; its murmurs and its mutinies; its fears and depressions; its buoyant hopes and its triumphant termination; are all set forth in a very interesting manner. Here, as in all previous and subsequent trials, the high and devoted heroism of Columbus was signally conspicuous. He had anticipated all the risks of his enterprise, calculated all its chances, and he had set life upon the hazard. His associates might shrink, his friends might fail him, his resources might not hold out, but none of these things had power to divert him from his quest; and we verily believe, that his own firm will and purpose would have led him onward to the last draught and the last morsel, without a misgiving of spirit or a glance behind. A singular illustration of this temper is observable in the tenacity with which he clung to his golden dreams of India and Cathay. Every island, when first seen, was, to his imagination, some headland of the coast of that El Dorado to which all his hopes and efforts tended. Every interview with the naked and simple natives of the Antilles, gave him fresh and brighter prospects, although his inferences were derived from insignificant gestures and an unknown tongue. If a savage pointed with his finger, the indication was instantly taken as to a realm where the earth was gold, its produce spices, its overhanging canopy an atmosphere of eternal spring, its inhabitants vested in silks, and glittering with rubies and diamonds. No disappointment could shake this conviction; no evidence dispel the cherished delusion; and when, at the last, he actually navigated the sea of pearls, and anchored on the coast where the soil was 'impregnated with gold,' the Gulf of Paria was, with him, the outlet of the rivers of Paradise, and the coast of Veragua he identified with the *Aurea Chersonesus* and the land of Ophir.

We are fairly, and somewhat sternly warned by Mr. Irving, against the indulgence of 'a certain meddlesome spirit, which, 'in the garb of learned research, goes prying about the traces

of history, casting down its monuments, and marring and 'mutilating its fairest trophies;' and we cordially agree with him in the intimation, that 'care should be taken to vindicate great names from such pernicious erudition.' We cannot, however, think, that this purpose is best answered by a determination to see every thing on the favourable side, and to ascribe all that is erroneous to something in one way or other connected with excellence. That Columbus was a great man in an age of great men, there can be no question. As little can it be doubted, that he was eminent for integrity, and for that high-minded enthusiasm which holds on for the end, regardless of the hazard or the cost. He was, with all this, a skilful seaman, a brave and able leader, a wise and beneficent administrator. And yet, we cannot get rid of the notion, that, notwithstanding evident indications of a simple motive and a single eye, there was somewhat of charlatanism in his character. We have not here in view that vulgar quackery which covers a base and selfish pursuit with the show of science, and the promise of boundless possession; but speak of that strange combination of lofty impulses and personal feelings, of just calculations and empirical assumptions, which has led many an accomplished chymist, in older times, to sacrifice health, talent, peace, in quest of the *elixir vitæ* and the philosopher's stone. Columbus was himself, assuredly, a firm believer in the substantial reality of the prospects he held out; but we apprehend that he cannot be acquitted of giving to Ferdinand and Isabella, descriptions of circumstances and probabilities, containing much more of colour and ornament than could be justified by an appeal either to fact or to his own anticipations. On one occasion, writing to those sovereigns of his anxieties and his hopes, he details a kind of vision, which Mr. Irving seems to think the effect of a diseased imagination, but which we are inclined to refer to the motives and manœuvres we have just described.

"Wearied and sighing," he says, "I fell into a slumber, when I heard a piteous voice saying to me, 'O fool, and slow to believe, and serve thy God, the God of all! What did he more for Moses, or for his servant David? From the time that thou wert born, he has ever taken great care of thee. When he saw thee of a fitting age, he made thy name to resound marvellously throughout the earth. The Indies, those rich parts of the world, he gave thee for thine own, and empowered thee to dispose of them to others according to thy pleasure. Of the gates of the ocean sea, shut up by such mighty chains, he delivered thee the keys, and thou wert obeyed in many lands, and didst acquire honorable fame among Christians. What did he more for the great people of Israel, when he led them forth from Egypt? Or for David, whom, from being a shepherd, he made a king? Turn to him, then, and acknowledge thine error; his mercy is infinite.

Thine age shall be no impediment to any great undertaking. Abraham was above an hundred years old when he begat Isaac: and was Sarah youthful? Thou urgest despondingly for succour. Answer! who has afflicted thee so much, and so many times?—God, or the world? The privileges and promises which God has made thee, he has never broken; nor said, after having received thy services, that his meaning was different, and to be understood in a different sense. He performs to the very letter. He fulfils all that he promises, and with increase. Such is his custom. I have shown thee what thy Creator has done for thee, and what he does for all. The present is the reward of the toils and perils thou hast endured in serving others.' I heard all this", adds Columbus, "as one almost dead, and had no power to reply to words so true, excepting to weep for my errors. Whoever it was that spake to me, finished by saying, 'Fear not! Confide! for these tribulations are written in marble, and not without cause.'"

The first voyage of Columbus resulted in the discovery of the Bahamas, Cuba, and Hispaniola. The second, added Jamaica and the Caribbee islands. In the third, Trinidad was coasted, and the Gulf of Paria navigated; and it was after this, as well as after much anxious contest with intrigue and insubordination, that he was arrested and sent back to Spain in irons. His fourth and last voyage was along the coast of Honduras and the Mosquito shore. No portion of the history is more interesting than this. The transactions at Veragua, the meeting of his men at Jamaica, with the singular vicissitudes that marked his adventures, are excellently narrated.

It is mortifying to human vanity to observe, how much of what is brilliant and profitable in discovery is assignable to accidental circumstances, and how little can be fairly ascribed to sagacity or design. The main enterprise of Columbus was entered on under the influence of a false hypothesis; and he was more than once on the very edge of those discoveries which enabled more fortunate adventurers, by following on his track, to achieve wealth and honours to a much greater extent, and with far less of personal endurance than fell to his lot. His portion was, indeed, one of severe endurance. He was vexed by mutinies and desertions, treated with ingratitude by the sovereigns whom he served, insulted by their minions, and constrained to waste his last days in petitioning the throne, and petitioning in vain, for his stipulated and nobly earned remuneration. But, of all these inflictions, the most deeply felt must have been his grief and indignation at the cruelty and misgovernment of his successors in authority over the regions he had given to Spain. The heart sickens at the detail of the senseless and unprovoked barbarities perpetrated by the Spanish governors. The Indians were hunted down by dogs;

their wives and children were violated and murdered; their caciques tortured and put to death; their dwelling-places desolated; and all this with a ferocious treachery that makes us blush for our common nature. The exterior contrast of the past and the present, is strikingly given by Mr. Irving, among the details of the second voyage.

‘Animated by one of the pleasing illusions of his ardent imagination, Columbus pursued his voyage, with a prosperous breeze, along the supposed continent of Asia. He was now opposite that part of the southern side of Cuba, where, for nearly thirty-five leagues, the navigation is unembarrassed by banks and islands. To his left was the broad and open sea, whose dark blue colour gave token of ample depth; to his right extended the richly wooded province of Ornofay, gradually sweeping up into a range of interior mountains; the verdant coast watered by innumerable streams, and studded with Indian villages. The appearance of the ships spread wonder and joy along the sea shore. The natives hailed with acclamations the arrival of these wonderful beings on their coast, whose fame had circulated more or less throughout the island, and who brought with them the blessings of Heaven. They came off swimming, or in their canoes, to offer the fruits and productions of the land, and regarded the white men almost with adoration. After the usual evening shower, when the breeze blew from the shore and brought off the sweetness of the land, it bore with it also the distant songs of the natives, and the sound of their rude music, as they were probably celebrating with their national chaunts and dances, the arrival of the white men. So delightful were these spicy odours and cheerful sounds to Columbus, who was at present open to all pleasurable influences, that he declared the night passed away as a single hour.

‘It is impossible to resist noticing the striking contrasts which are sometimes forced upon the mind. The coast here described so populous and animated, rejoicing in the visit of the discoverers, is the same that extends westward of the city of Trinidad, along the gulf of Xagua. All is now silent and deserted: civilization, which has covered some parts of Cuba with glittering cities, has rendered this a solitude. The whole race of Indians has long since passed away, pining and perishing beneath the domination of the strangers, whom they welcomed so joyfully to their shores. Before me lies the account of a night recently passed on this very coast, by a celebrated traveller, but with what different feelings from those of Columbus! “I past”, says he, “a great part of the night upon the deck. What deserted coasts! Not a light to announce the cabin of a fisherman. From Batabano to Trinidad, a distance of fifty leagues, there does not exist a village. Yet in the time of Columbus, this land was inhabited even along the margin of the sea. When pits are digged in the soil, or the torrents plough open the surface of the earth, there are often found hatchets of stone and vessels of copper, relics of the ancient inhabitants of the island.”’

Columbus, broken down with his labours and privations,

died on the 20th of May, 1506, at the age of about seventy. His ungrateful sovereign ordered the erection of a monument, with this inscription:—

‘POR CASTILLA Y POR LEON
NUEVO MUNDO HALLO COLON.’

‘*For Castile and Leon Columbus found a New World.*’

Mr. Irving's last chapter is devoted to a delineation of the character of Columbus, written in his own interesting way, though somewhat deficient in discrimination. We have felt strongly tempted to extract a considerable portion of this section, but we have given enough to assist our readers in forming a general estimate of the work, and we desist.

Art. IV. *The United States of North America as they are.* 8vo. pp. 242. Price 7s. 6d. London. 1828.

THIS volume bears somewhat too broadly the marks of being written by a party man. The Writer's chief object seems to be, to undeceive the good people on this side the Atlantic, as to the real character of his American majesty President Adams, and his prime minister Mr. Clay; to denounce their anti-patriotic, and at the same time anti-British principles and designs, and to hold up Major-General Andrew Jackson, the present head of the Opposition, as the fittest man to fill the chair of Washington. Aware of the many inaccuracies of his style, the Writer modestly entreats, in his preface, ‘that liberal ‘indulgence which a *stranger* is allowed to claim at the hands ‘of a great and generous nation.’ Are we to infer from this, that he is himself a native of the United States? This we can hardly believe, nor do we think that an American would feel occasion to apologize for any inaccuracy in writing his native tongue. Besides, in the foregoing paragraph, he seems to speak of himself as only a resident in that country.

‘The Author is conscious that, in treating of the political state of America, his observations may be deemed severe. This severity of reproof may perhaps have become natural to him, from having, *during a residence of a series of years*, been accustomed to hear the President treated by the Opposition with less deference than the meanest citizen; but he may be allowed to say, that he has never permitted himself any exaggeration, or even a solitary sarcasm at the expense of truth. He is persuaded that time will confirm his statements.’

His object, he tells us moreover, has been, ‘to exhibit to ‘the eyes of the world, the state of American affairs, without

‘prejudice and without party spirit.’ In this, we cannot say that he has succeeded. There is, we have no doubt, a great deal of substantial truth in most of his statements, and we are obliged to him for the information and amusement which his volume has afforded; but these high pretensions to calm impartiality might better have been withheld. They do not comport with the style of the work; and it is expecting too much from any intelligent reader, to demand this implicit confidence in the testimony of an anonymous foreigner.

The progress of the United States during the fifty years of their existence, is justly termed unparalleled in the history of nations. Thirteen states have increased to twenty-four; a population of two millions and a half has risen to eleven millions. The public revenues, which, in 1784, were scarcely six millions of dollars, are now twenty-five millions. The national debt amounts to no more than seventy-four millions, and is rapidly diminishing. ‘The clergy is without tithes, and peace and tranquillity prevail without a secret police, and without an army.’ The Americans have, however, a navy, which commands respect, although we do not think that it needs awake jealousy or apprehension. Upwards of a thousand steam-vessels and merchant-men are daily importing the productions of the most distant countries, and diffusing them through the interior of the Union by means of rivers navigable for thousands of miles.

‘A single state (New York) has completed what is unexampled in the Old World, China alone excepted; a canal 360 miles in length. Another state (Ohio) will have finished, in the course of next year, a second canal 300 miles long; thus establishing an artificial water communication of nearly 3000 miles,—beyond all comparison the most extensive on the face of the earth. Above thirty other canals are in progress; among them the Pennsylvania and the Chesapeake; the former partly finished, and scarcely yielding in length to that of New York.—About twelve years ago, there arrived at Leghorn a ship built at Pittsburgh, and cleared out from that place. The master presented his papers to the custom-house officers, who would not give credit to them, insisting that the papers must have been forged, as there was no such port as Pittsburgh, and accordingly the vessel was to be confiscated. The captain laid before the officer a map of the United States, directed his attention to the Gulf of Mexico, pointed out the mouth of the Mississippi, led him a thousand miles up to the mouth of the Ohio, and from thence a thousand miles to Pittsburgh: “This, Sir, is the port from whence my vessel has cleared out.” The astonished officer would as soon have believed that it had been navigated from the moon.’

It may seem paradoxical to assert, that an Englishman is almost disqualified for taking a fair view of America. The

truth is, however, that a panegyric upon that vigorous young republic seems to put John Bull immediately into a defensive attitude. Being accustomed to hear the United States puffed off as the paradise of emigrants, a land where tithes and poor-rates, test-acts and game-laws are unknown, he is naturally led, by such disparaging innuendoes, to regard Brother Jonathan as an upstart rival, rather than as a younger brother; and, as the natural consequence of this jealous feeling, to depreciate what he would otherwise applaud, and to affect contempt towards a people who are most deserving of his kindest admiration. It is not in comparison with England, that the United States can be estimated to most advantage. Those Americans who provoke this comparison, are as unwise, as those English writers who are perpetually drawing the contrast are unjust. To estimate aright the stupendous political phenomenon which is exhibited by this rapid expansion of a colony into an empire, we must abstract our minds from the petty points of comparison, and judge of the United States in the same independent light, and with the same candour and just allowance for circumstances, that would be thought proper in estimating the internal condition, institutions, and national character of any other foreign country. Let the United States, if comparison must be made, be viewed in contrast—we will not say with Turkey or Persia, nor with Italy or Spain, but with France, Germany, or Russia,—with Brazil, Mexico, or Canada; let the sum of intelligence, of moral and religious feeling, and of social happiness under their respective systems of government and institutions, be the subject of the estimate; and every true Englishman will then be irresistibly impelled to regard the republic of Washington with feelings of unmixed and cordial admiration, and to rejoice in its growing prosperity and greatness as identified with the best interests of man.

Many of the most vaunted advantages which America holds out as a temptation to emigrants, are accidental, or at least temporary, arising from its being a young and imperfectly peopled country, retaining much of its colonial character. It is observable, on the other hand, that many of the faults chargeable on the Americans as a people, have their origin in the same circumstances; and time will certainly introduce many important modifications into the national character. At present, ‘although ‘the United States,’ remarks the present Writer, ‘exhibit a ‘greater uniformity of manners than any other nation, yet there ‘is still found a striking difference among them.’

‘In the eastern sea-ports, you will find the manners of an European metropolis, alloyed by the pride of wealth, which, as it is the only mark of distinction, is not calculated to encourage courteous

and social habits. In the central parts, from the Alleghany Mountains down to Cincinnati, a truly republican character is more than anywhere conspicuous. It is liberal, unassuming, hospitable, and independent. Further on, we find the half-cultivated indigence of a rising population.

‘The different States themselves vary not less in their characteristic features; and a Yankee of Massachusetts is in many respects as dissimilar to a Kentuckian, as the Irishman differs from a Scotch highlander. Situation, climate, and occupation gradually lend a distinct feature to each separate State; contending interests also contribute to establish a character which differs more or less with (from) that of its neighbour.

‘The ruling passion of the American is the love of money. Vain indeed would be the attempt to vindicate his character on this point: with him, worldly prosperity and merit are indissolubly connected. Something, however, may be conceded to this feeling, when it is considered as springing from the very nature of his public institutions; for in the absence of artificial distinctions, wealth is the grand passport to public and private importance.

‘Though this cupidity is certainly too far extended, and a sordid love of money is everywhere prevalent, yet it is but fair to state, that there is not a people on earth, who, when in possession of wealth, make a more beneficial and liberal use of it. An American, it is true, will consult his own interest; he will not hesitate to sacrifice health and every thing dear to him, and will even not be over-scrupulous in the selection of means to accomplish his purpose. But wealth obtained, he will not only contribute to the comfort of his family, but to that of the people in general; he will not only advance the improvement of his immediate locality, and encourage the institutions of his county or state, but with the same eagerness he will give his subscriptions to colleges and churches five hundred miles distant from his residence, and often in preference to those around him, if productive of more beneficial consequences. Thus, as we have stated, sprung up most of the literary institutions and churches in the north. There are a thousand examples of this liberality.

‘The liberality of the American, and, what is still better, his sound sense, is nowhere more striking than in the cities, and the public and private buildings of the United States.’ p. 232—235.

As you may discover the monarch in the splendid palaces of the Tuilleries, Versailles, the Louvre, and in the magnificent royal squares and gardens of Paris, so, the smallest American village, it is remarked, will serve to indicate that ‘the sovereignty is in the people.’ Of the ‘airy, light, comfortable, elegant American cities,’ New York is described as the most splendid; Philadelphia as the plainest and most aristocratic. Boston is ‘the most solid, as it is the most literary and refined city of the Union.’ Washington is the American Dublin, laid out in the grandest style, but its completion will never perhaps

be effected. Even Baltimore, Richmond, New Albany, New Orleans, and Cincinnati are said to be handsome cities. Mr. Bullock's projected city, on the model of the Regent's Park buildings, is to outshine them all in magnificence of architecture.

' In Philadelphia, New York, Boston, and the larger commercial towns, the style of buildings is splendid, and exhibits a taste and liberality equally conspicuous. These are visible in their elegant carpets, splendid lustres, richly decorated pulpits and communion-tables, together with a gilded organ and tasteful pews. I allow that vanity may have had some share in these embellishments, but the display of it on these occasions is entitled to indulgence. In the flat country from Philadelphia to Harrisburgh, a distance of one hundred miles in length and breadth, there are many churches in a style of architectural beauty which would not disgrace any European city, and these are erected by country congregations at their own expense. It is not unusual to see a farmer in but moderate circumstances, subscribe from two to three hundred dollars. Pittsburgh, which is not more than fifty years in existence, has now ten churches, amongst which is the Trinity church, completed in 1825, in a style of Gothic elegance, worthy an European metropolis. Several members of its congregation subscribed five hundred dollars; and yet, this city, though, perhaps, wealthy, is far from being very opulent. Greensburgh, on the Philadelphia road, thirty miles on this side of Pittsburgh, has, for a population not exceeding eighteen hundred souls, no less than four churches, and the country congregation which is without at least a wooden meeting-house, is either very small, or a very poor one indeed.

' About Greensburgh there are seven German congregations, who have elegant brick churches, each consisting of from fifty to sixty families. Not long ago, one of these was finished at the expense of six thousand dollars.' pp. 137, 8.

' Taken on the whole,' says this Writer,

' the American national character is certainly aspiring, energetic, shrewd, and intelligent; but this character, though respectable, is not altogether amiable. It is neither that of the steady, noble, and generous English, nor has it the sincerity or the intense feeling of the German, nor the lively, and even in its levity, the still amiable disposition of the French. It exhibits the unnatural picture of a cold philosophical youth, united with the worst vice of age—avarice. There is not a nation which, abstracted from its political institutions, has less friends, or whose intrinsic powers and excellent qualities have been more slighted and ridiculed by English writers. There is but one voice respecting these insults, from Boston down to New Orleans, from Washington to St. Louis, and it is that of bitter complaint. The fault is on both sides. It would be in vain to shelter the Americans from those faults and vices which we have already mentioned, and many of which we should not have expected from English descendants. So it would be

unreasonable to expect a very friendly disposition from (between) two nations, the one of which is in possession of the commerce of the world, and of the dominion of the ocean, and the other (of) which aspires to wrest this superiority from the grasp of Great Britain. But it must not be disguised, that those English writers of travels who speak of the United States, were generally prejudiced, and always not qualified to form a correct opinion of this rising and powerful nation. These writings exhibit, if not a total want of information, such an absence of that philosophical research, so necessary to give Englishmen a correct idea of their shrewd and intelligent rival, that it is not to be wondered at that so much error and prejudice exist. The result has been highly injurious to the cause of truth, and to the interests of Great Britain. Her leading journals, adopting these opinions, have contributed by their systematic attacks, to elevate and strengthen the national character of the Americans, and to concentrate its energies against a country, whose most distinguished literary talents they see arrayed against their advancement. The national honour and the national feeling, which would for a while have slumbered, have awakened to prove that such sarcasms are unmerited. He must personally have witnessed through a series of years, the exasperation, the rankling animosity, which these attacks, repeated in numberless newspapers, have spread through millions of freemen, to be a fair judge of their powerful operation on the American character. They see themselves slighted by the only nation for whom they have a real esteem. Though the resources of the United States are not to be placed in comparison with those of Great Britain, yet, to exasperate the spirit of this infant-giant, and to direct its accumulating energies against herself—and to do this merely for the occasion of indulging in a sneer, is neither generous, nor politic, nor just.' p. 240—2.

We are sorry to say, that the present Writer will not be thought to stand clear of the fault which he here charges, somewhat too indiscriminately, upon English writers. With regard to the sordid love of money which is represented as the ruling passion of the Americans, it will not be contended, that it can be a stronger or more prominent feature of their national character, than it is of individual character in this country. It forms the main-spring of commercial enterprise, and the American citizens may be described as 'a nation of merchants.' Wealth is the virtue of the exchange; it is responsibility, character, goodness. In this country, it can do what in America it cannot just at present; it can purchase rank, nobility, and make a Jew broker a prime agent in affairs of state. But still, in England, this mercantile character is limited to a class. The aristocracy of wealth is not the only one. Our *old* wealth, in the shape of territorial possession, is a sort of counterpoise to new wealth in the hands of the capitalist. We have 'dead weights' to balance our political system, and prejudices in favour of what

is old, that serve to counteract the over activity of innovation. And so it will be in America fifty years hence. Whether the form of government shall remain the same or not, an aristocracy will become more consolidated; the distinction between old and new families will be widened; wealth will become less omnipotent; merit and industry will have to struggle harder against proscription and prejudice; and America will approximate more and more to the condition of an old country.

Mr. Adams is said to be at the head of the American Tories. He is supported at once by the Yankees, that is, the New England States, and by the Virginia aristocracy. From the latter state, and from the family of Adams, the six Presidents have been chosen. Thus, we are told, 'the first magistracy has become, 'in a certain degree, a family fief, and through the family of 'Adams, is likely to change into a monarchy.' He is said to have uttered, when secretary of state, these 'memorable words': 'The United States will not be ranked among nations till the 'Presidency becomes hereditary.'

'Adams is reputed by his party and the majority of the people, to possess a great mind: this is far from being the case. His talents are rather of an ordinary kind, but they are not the less dangerous on that account; for it is not the greatest, but the coldest and most persevering statesman, alike insensible to contempt and to praise, who is most obnoxious to the freedom of a nation. His style, a mixture of the elegant and the diplomatic, is admired, because it is new to the United States. It cannot be denied, that it is the most fit to disguise his political opinions and his deep-laid schemes. This motive, and his predilection for every thing coming from the eastern courts, may sufficiently account for his adoption of and fondness for it. If taken upon the whole, he may be considered a most dangerous man to the freedom of the Union, and if he had been sent by Metternich himself, he could not pursue more closely the principles of the Holy Alliance.' p. 21.

Mr. Adams is said to have secured the presidency, by consenting to unite with his antagonist, Mr. Clay, as first minister. Their characters and principles were once diametrically opposite, and 'their enmity, till the week previous to the election, 'so notorious, that Clay would have been the last person upon 'whom Adams, if unfettered, would have fixed his choice.' But, says this Writer,—and the remark will not apply to America only:—

'Political enmities and friendships have this much in common, that their duration is just so long as the parties find it to suit their purposes. If the nation has no other guarantee for the fidelity of its servants, its interests are in bad hands: unfortunately there was none.'

'The very circumstance which separated the political antagonists, was the cause of their union—ambition. Mr. Adams and Mr. Clay found out and understood one another. The very men who but a week before hated each other most cordially, and never met except on public and unavoidable occasions, now spent whole nights together in a clandestine manner. In what light the nation would view these proceedings, on the part of men of their character, there could be no question: Adams and Clay had succeeded in dispelling the prejudices about the rights of the people. A formal bargain was concluded, which gave the nation, for the term of four years, into the hands of Mr. Adams. The stipulated price for which the Speaker bound himself to join Mr. Adams was the Secretaryship of State. This being agreed to, Mr. Clay, with his friends, went over to Mr. Adams and his party.'

'To describe the temper of the nation after these events is scarcely in my power. The suppressed malicious smile of the Tories, who dared not manifest their mischievous joy at their victory; the republican Federalist doubtfully shaking his head at the triumph of a party which not many years before actually intended to sell their country; the simple Democrat who had but an obscure idea of the whole proceedings, and was unable to comprehend, how the great gentlemen could have been so blind as to prefer a Tory to the second Washington (Jackson); the Radicals, finally, who had conceived, from Jackson's elevation, very sanguine hopes respecting offices, and now saw themselves so cruelly disappointed, loudly denouncing treachery, and crying out for civil war—such were the scenes that might everywhere be witnessed. The power which the law certainly exercises upon the citizen of the United States (at least the northern) was, on this occasion, seen to advantage. Notwithstanding the disappointment of his fondest hopes, he attempted not the least opposition to the object of his hatred, who was now elected his first magistrate. There were several exhibitions and illuminations, at which Mr. Clay was hung, and afterwards burnt in effigy, while John Adams was mentioned in rather less honourable terms; but that was all.' pp. 14—16.

Mr. Clay's party consists of the Kentucky and Missouri people. He was originally a lawyer in that state, and was chosen for his oratorical talents as its representative.

'In this capacity he distinguished himself by a nervous, a natural, and a practical eloquence—*ad hominem*. A quick penetration, and a self-possession which scarcely any thing could disturb, procured him influence; and a daring presumption, common to the Kentuckians, gave him preponderance. . . . As plenipotentiary at the Treaty of Ghent, he played rather an indifferent part, and quarrelled with Adams. The explanations promised by him to the nation, respecting Adams's conduct at Ghent, we are still waiting for. His influence became overbearing, and so much power did he possess over the minds of his fellow-representatives, that there was little doubt of his being elected President, in case of his return to the house as one of the three candidates. His peculiar talent consists

in making himself popular with his State. In order to win his countrymen over to his interests, he plays as easily the part of the drunkard and the gambler, as in good company he can put on the gentleman. The Kentuckian, however, is apparent, and his coarse impetuosity breaks forth on every occasion. This latter circumstance, so far from affecting his popularity, renders him the idol of his countrymen. "That is a mighty great man! That is a wonderfully eminent man! That is the very first man in the Union!" you may hear from every Kentuckian, and be knocked down if you should not be precisely of the same opinion.

'Clay has in his person very little that is attractive; a disagreeable face, grey piercing eyes, full of a wild and malicious fire, distinguish the shrewd and impetuous politician, who knows no delicacy in the choice of his means. No other State but Kentucky would have forgiven Clay's breach of trust. The Kentuckians were angry only so long as they were unacquainted with the price of this job *en gros*; as soon as they had the opening prospect of offices from their countryman, the present Secretary of State, he again became their favourite. It is no small honour to the other States, that they deeply feel the wound inflicted on the moral principle of the Republic, and accordingly hold its author in abomination. None of the twenty-two States would choose him under the present circumstances for a constable. His private life is far from being exemplary: a duellist and a gambler, he has neither principle nor a sense of what is due to decorum.' pp. 30, 31.

We agree with the Writer, that the character of a gambler and a duellist very ill comports with that of the statesman or the patriot. Justice, however, requires the humiliating admission, that America is not the only country in which public men have disgraced themselves by their private vices. If Mr. Clay is to be considered as morally disqualified for his high station by the misconduct imputed to him, what shall be said of certain of our own ministers and legislators? In point of either public or private character, the American Secretary of State will not, we apprehend, suffer from comparison with that of the white-washed ruffian, General Jackson; and it augurs ill for the Republican party, that such a man should now be put forward as its champion and leader. There would seem to be in America, as in Europe, at this crisis, a miserable dearth of first-rate or commanding talent in combination with high patriotic character and political integrity, in public men.

Mr. Clay is now regarded, at least by his party, as the first of American orators. A volume of his collected Speeches has recently appeared in Philadelphia; 'the first volume of speeches of one individual ever published' in the United States. The last Number of the *North American Review* (October 1827) contains an article upon this volume; but we were

disappointed at meeting with no extracts from the *Speeches* by way of specimen. It is indeed intimated, that a *satisfactory* specimen could scarcely be found in an insulated fragment, taken out of the context. As this publication is not much known in this country, and ranks high among the American periodical Journals, we shall transcribe the Reviewer's remarks upon the subject of the article.

‘Mr. Clay belongs to the class of men, numerous in all free countries, and in no country so numerous as in ours,—the architects of their own fortunes; men who, without early advantages, rise to eminence by the force of talent and industry. The eloquence of such a man will partake of the merits and of the defects which are naturally incident to a want of the best opportunities in youth, and to practice commenced and continued, not in the retreats of academic leisure, but at the bar and in the senate. The great orators of Greece and Rome learned their profession of actors, sophists, rhetoricians, and philosophers; shut themselves up in caves for solitary exercise; made voyages that they might get access to the best teachers; practised before looking-glasses, and trained their voices by declamation. These arts or means are unknown to the ardent young American, who is launched on the stormy ocean of life, with no other inheritance, than that of “infancy, ignorance, and indigence.” As he advances to manhood, he will gradually form his own manner. It will commonly be earnest but inartificial; its alternate strains of argument and passion will succeed each other rather by accident, than in the order prescribed by systems of rhetoric. There will be fullness of matter, without exhaustion, perhaps without the most skilful disposition of topics; and vigour and impressiveness of style, connected with occasional inaccuracies of language.

‘Such, in general, is the character of these speeches. In connexion with some of the remarks which we have made above, on the manner of reporting which prevails in this country, we ought not to omit to state, that the speeches contained in the volume before us are understood to be given, without subsequent revision, as they appeared originally in the *National Intelligencer*, from the pen of the reporter. Few orators in any country have ever been more negligent of fame than Mr. Clay. Not one half of his speeches, we believe, have ever appeared in any form of report, and those reported have almost without exception been left by him to the unrevised preparation of the reporter. No person who has had occasion to make such a course a matter of experience, will refuse to admit, that it puts the reputation of the speaker to the greatest test.

‘In casting the eye over the list of the speeches contained in the volume, we find them to comprehend a wide and varied range of topics. They are on the subject of manufactures, on the line of the *Perdido*, on the charter of the Bank of the United States, on the augmentation of the military force of the country, on the increase of the navy, on the new army bill, on the emancipation of South America, on internal improvement, on the Seminole war, on a mission to South America, on the tariff, on the Spanish treaty, another

speech on the mission to South America, on internal improvement, and on American industry. The reader will perceive, in this catalogue, the greatest questions in our internal policy, in our foreign relations, and in our recent history. On perusing Mr. Clay's speeches on any or all of these subjects, and comparing them with those of his contemporaries in Congress, on the same or kindred topics, we presume it will be cheerfully admitted, on all hands, that he ranks second to none in the originality, power, and versatility of his intellect. In those physical qualities by which the ability and reputation of the orator are graduated, and in that general reputation of a parliamentary speaker, which is built on political standing, on intellectual talent, and external gifts, Mr. Clay would probably, by a large majority of the American people, be allowed to have stood first on the roll of the eminent men who were associated with him in Congress.

'We are not sure that such would be the opinion of those who should estimate his character as a parliamentary speaker, solely from the perusal of the speeches contained in the volume before us. In point of literary execution and rhetorical finish, they are not to be considered as models. They should be regarded in justice, as what they purport to be, reports of speeches, for the most part unrevised by the author. Compared with other speeches appearing under the same circumstances, they appear to the first advantage. They ought not to be contrasted with that class of productions of ancient or modern orators, which owe their exquisite finish, their well compacted order, their faultless correctness, and harmonious proportions, not to the inspiration of the forum and the senate-house, but to the leisure of the closet. It is recorded by Plutarch both of Pericles and of Demosthenes, that they ever refused to speak except on premeditation, even though the assembly loudly called on them, by name, to defend their own measures; and we find by the 'Life of Sheridan,' that his *impromptus*, both of wit and passion, passed through several editions in his study, before they were uttered in Parliament, and that he even marked down beforehand the places for "Good God, Mr. Speaker." Of this kind of preparation the orations of Mr. Clay exhibit no trace. We are quite sure, that not one of them was written before it was delivered, and we perceive in the greater part of them no marks of subsequent revision.

'It is a necessary consequence of this, that they contain few single passages likely to be quoted as prominent specimens of oratorical declamation. It deserves remark, that in the orations of the greatest orators of the modern world, those passages which are selected as specimens of style, as extracts for declamation, are evidently such as received, either before or after delivery, the benefit of the *limæ labor et mora*, and which consequently evince not so much the talent of the speaker as the skill of the writer. We suppose no one will think that the apostrophe to filial piety dropped unwritten from the lips of Sheridan. The inimitable passages on the attachment of the colonies to the mother country, in Burke's speech on Conciliation with America, and the terrific description of Hyder Ally's invasion of the Carnatic, must with equal certainty have been

written. Of such passages as Curran's on universal emancipation, we are informed, that they were written beforehand, in the style of the ancient rhetorical exercises on the topics, to be used when they might happen to be wanted. Of eloquence of this kind (and some may think it the highest kind, because it gives to some brilliant idea, struck out in a happy moment of inspiration, all the advantage of judgement and meditation, in clothing it in words) the speeches of Mr. Clay contain no specimens. In this respect, however, they resemble the printed speeches of the first orators of the age. The man who should read the collected volumes of the speeches of Mr. Fox and Mr. Pitt, with a view to the selection of the brilliant flights of oratory, would close his task in disappointment. The disappointment, we think, would be more complete in the case of Fox than in that of Pitt, although Fox is allowed to have had the finer genius. The excellence of both, as parliamentary speakers, lay in an unsurprised readiness to grapple with any subject, and in the full flow of thought with which any subject was taken up and pursued; added, in Pitt, to the effect of a lofty display of conscious political power, and in Fox, to an ever burning zeal and intensity of feeling. Of this school is the parliamentary eloquence of Mr. Clay. It is that of the debater, of the politician, the prominent leader of a powerful party, or the hearty champion of some great and favourite cause.

'Before and during the war of 1812, Mr. Clay was among the most conspicuous of the acknowledged leaders in Congress. On his first entrance into the House of Representatives, he was elected to the chair of that body, which, under the peculiar circumstances of the times, possessed the efficient power of the government. Several of the speeches in the volume before us date from that period, and may be considered as among those which gave the tone to the legislation of the day. After the close of the war by the treaty of Ghent, in the negotiation of which he bore an honourable part, Mr. Clay took up with great ardour the cause of South American independence. This was a cause wholly unconnected with the questions which had formerly divided the country; it was in itself, in its political principles, and in its considerations of expediency, a matter of speculation. To Mr. Clay belongs the credit of having first called the attention of Congress and the people to this great subject; and of having contributed an earlier and a greater share, than any other person, to the weight of argument and the power of persuasion, by which the public sentiment on the subject was eventually fixed. In the untried circumstances of the case, the administration of Mr. Monroe held itself, for some time, uncommitted, and limited its policy to measures of inquiry and observation. This gave to the efforts of Mr. Clay, to obtain an immediate recognition of the independence of the new republics, the form of an opposition to the administration of Mr. Monroe. His speeches on this subject, not all of which have been reported, are among the most powerful and brilliant productions of his mind, and passages of them were read with enthusiasm at the head of the South American armies. Another class of subjects, with respect to which Mr. Clay has borne a part not less conspicuous, is that of internal improvement and domestic manufactures.

Domestic manufactures form the subject of the first and of the last of his speeches in Congress, contained in this volume; and the latter speech wears the appearance of more careful preparation than any other which the book contains. The first of these is of the class of great constitutional questions; and in the different speeches of Mr. Clay on the subject, the entire strength of the argument in favour of the constitutional power of the general government to make internal improvements, will be found to be comprised.' p. 443—447.

The following intelligent strictures on the low state of *congressional* eloquence in America, will, we think, be interesting to our readers. They will serve both to corroborate and to explain the somewhat ludicrous account given by the present Writer, of the proceedings in the House of Representatives; and at the same time, will throw some light on the rise and growth of parliamentary eloquence among ourselves.

'The congressional eloquence of America is, we think, in no high repute among ourselves. We do not refer merely to the habitual sarcasm or ridicule thrown upon it, mostly for purposes of personal satire or party detraction. To this kind of reproach every part of the machinery of a free government is ever obnoxious. Where the press is free, men will joke their political opponents; and the English Parliament is as sadly quizzed as the American Congress, by all the real or affected *beaux esprits*, who constitute themselves guardians of the public weal. If classical authority be wanted, Pericles was the great butt of the satirists of his day. But we apprehend that, in America, the matter goes a little further than this. The debates in Congress appear to us to be spoken disrespectfully of, by many of the judicious portion of the community; of that portion, who really say less than they feel and think, and whose censures deserve to be listened to.

'This consideration has suggested to us the propriety of some inquiry into the different character of the eloquence of the English Parliament and of the American Congress, and of the causes of this difference, if any substantial difference shall be found to exist. We may perhaps trace the superiority of the English parliamentary eloquence, in part, to circumstances incompatible with our free institutions.

'In the English Parliament, there are fewer speakers than in the American Congress. Except on rare occasions, which call out particular individuals not otherwise accustomed to debate, three or four members on the ministerial side of the house, and as many more on the opposition, are all that speak on questions of general interest. These individuals may not be the same on every question; but one gentleman is more likely to speak on a matter of foreign politics, another on retrenchment, a third on the Catholic question, a fourth on parliamentary reform, and not more than one or two on either side undertake the character of general champions. One of these is of course the leading minister on the side of government, and occasion-

ally, an individual has, we believe, been formally designated as the leader of his majesty's opposition.

' Various causes may account for this paucity of speakers in the House of Commons. There is little motive for the inexperienced, the inefficient, the uninformed (of whom there is a larger portion in the House of Commons than in the American Congress), to attempt to speak. Every question is sure to be discussed in a masterly manner, by a sufficient number of first-rate men; and what should tempt the others to place themselves in so disadvantageous a contrast? In this country there are many motives. The fear of the constituent is one. Members are sent from their several districts by a free choice of the citizens, and they suppose their constituents have an eye upon them, to see how they acquit themselves, at least to see that they acquit themselves somehow. The seat of government is remote from most of the districts, and its population is not large enough to possess of itself an operative public sentiment, whereas London is the great sensorium of the British empire. The member of parliament who does not produce a favourable impression at London, produces none at all, but is irretrievably lost. With us, the least concern of a member of Congress is how he stands at Washington. His heart is in Carolina, in Maine, or beyond the Alleghanies. With these distant regions he communicates through the press. The speaking is the smallest part of the business; it is only the occasion, the justification, for publishing a speech in the newspapers, and perhaps in a pamphlet, to be sent home to his constituents.

' In England, this fear of the constituent exists, indeed, to a certain extent, but far less than in this country, either as to intensity or generality. One class of members of the House of Commons hold their places entirely independent of any form of popular election. Certainly the members from Old Sarum have to make no speeches to satisfy their constituents. Another class of members of Parliament may take upon their lips that well known reply of a loving member to those whom he purported to represent: "— you, gentlemen, I have bought you, and do you think I will not sell you?" When Burke knocked down one of Lord Somebody's ninepins, the afore-said ninepin did not need to make a speech to his constituents to get himself up again; it was enough if he stood *rectus in curiâ* with his master. Still, however, this class of members is by no means, as a class, the most insignificant. Organized as English society is, the rotten and close boroughs are the means by which a very considerable part of the talent of the House of Commons is brought within its walls. The representation of the counties is monopolized by the most powerful and wealthy families in them, and can rarely be contested but at an enormous expense. The matter is nearly the same with the populous boroughs; and it is only the boroughs which are avowedly or virtually under patronage, or influence amounting to patronage, that give entrance to men of talent, unsupported by fortune, but brought forward by political or personal friends. It is plain, however, that composed as we have represented the House of Commons to be, there is much less inducement to speak to the ear of the constituent than with us.

‘ Out of some of the same causes grows a party discipline in the English House of Commons, of which we here know little or nothing. Men there depend more for their political standing on their party, and less on their constituents. In the ordinary state of things in our own country, the attempt to lead, on the part of a few individuals of a party, meets with no success. Neither side of the House of Representatives, or of the Senate of the United States, would submit to have the liberty of speech engrossed by half a dozen members. A half dozen others, believing themselves, and justly perhaps, equal to the designated few, would be ready, on the first occasion, to throw off their allegiance, and speak for themselves and their constituents. The political leaders, in fact, in this country, seem to be perpetually baffled by the difficulty of getting followers. “Make way, gentlemen,” (once cried a Massachusetts representative to the populace, who were crowding him out of his place, in the procession on election day,) “make way, we are the representatives of the people.” “Make way yourself,” replied a sturdy member of the throng, “we are the people themselves.” Excepting in a time of keen political warfare and high party excitement, there is no principle, on which a few individuals would here be permitted to monopolize the privilege of speaking in either house of Congress, however great their superiority over their brethren. In the House of Commons, it is not only no assumption for a few men, on each side, to take the thing pretty much into their own hands; but the assumption is thought to be on the part of the member who, not being of the *élite*, should presume to take up the time of the house. A new member is, we believe, usually listened to with great forbearance and even courtesy. Common justice of course demands, that the stranger should be permitted to offer a taste of his quality. Once heard, he is allowed to rise as high as mere merit will carry him, or the merit he may have, united with such other means of rising as are in his power. But no man is suffered, for any length of time, to whet his dullness on the House of Commons. That is not the place, where downright incapacity is allowed, by oft essaying and frequent failure, to work itself up into a respectable measure of prosing mediocrity. If, on the first or second trial, the unfledged legislator fail, he is remanded, beyond appeal, to the Freemason’s Hall and the Crown and Anchor Tavern, to move resolutions at charitable meetings, and return thanks for the drinking of his health at a public dinner.

‘ To the different style of speaking in this point, the accommodations of the members of Congress and of Parliament are respectively adapted. The House of Commons is small, about sixty feet by forty; and furnished with benches (disposed like those usually seen in lecture-rooms where no notes are expected to be taken), on which the members are very closely crowded together. The hall of the House of Representatives contains three hundred thousand cubic feet; twice as many as Fanueil Hall in Boston; and each member is furnished with a luxurious accommodation for sitting and writing. As far as the speaking is concerned, this naturally leads to a habit of minute, discursive, prolix note-taking, an equalization of unimportant and important points (because a member replies not to the great heads of

the opposing argument, which have imprinted themselves on his memory, but to every little proposition, of which he has made a note), and finally to an equalization of good and bad speakers. Other evils are incident to the mode in which the two houses are furnished, which operate perniciously on the character of our legislation, as well as on the aspect of our legislature. It is now, we believe, generally admitted, that the House of Representatives, at least, convenes in a splendid hall, in which it is difficult to see, speak, or hear, and which is consequently destitute of the three first and most important properties of a hall of legislation. Scarcely a session passes without the waste of some time and money on ineffectual attempts at a remedy. The evil will, we trust, be so practically felt at length, that the necessity will be acknowledged of providing a place of meeting, which, if less adapted for the conveniences of writing, reading, and promiscuous lounging, will be better fitted for the purposes of hearing, seeing, speaking, and the despatch of business. Strange as it may at first appear, the evil of excessive speaking is encouraged and increased by the difficulty of being heard in the hall. This difficulty furnishes a salvo to vanity, which might otherwise be wounded. Members may ascribe, and often justly, the coldness with which they are heard, to the difficulty of hearing. Hence, the inattention of the audience is no proof of the indifference of the speech; and by an easy inference of self-love, men are able to persuade themselves, that listless spectators and empty benches are no good reasons for abstaining from debate. The vast space to be filled also tempts to vociferation, to exaggerated gesture, to weary repetition, and a sort of desperate effort, on the part of members, to produce by length, that effect which they cannot aim at in a shorter discourse, of which every sentence would tell.

‘ But although these and some other considerations, of the like general nature, may partly account for the style of speaking which prevails in our Congress, we believe it is in a great degree to be ascribed to the manner in which the speeches are reported.’

‘ The growth of parliamentary eloquence in England has kept pace with the march of free principles in the country, and the necessary deference of the government to the public sentiment, in the administration of affairs. Burke is reported to have said, that “ the debates a century ago were comparative vestry discussions to what they afterwards became.” This change, in the opinion of his biographer, “ was chiefly owing to Burke himself.” He is considered, “ by the enlarged views, by the detailed expositions of policy, the intermixture of permanent truths bearing on temporary facts, and the general lustre and air of wisdom, which he was the first to introduce at large into parliamentary discussions, greatly to have exalted the character of Parliament itself, and by the display of his own characteristics to have excited the emulation of others.”

‘ No person can be more disposed than we, to ascribe to the influence of Burke’s example all that can be effected by that of any man, and more than was effected by that of any other man. But would the eloquence of Burke itself have been what it was, but for the aid which the press began at this period to yield to the debates?

Does not the whole elaborate structure of his speeches show, that they were conceived under the operation of the assurance, that they would go out to the world? Had these splendid orations, one after another, died away within the narrow walls of the House of Commons, and nothing of them gone forth, but the evanescent rumor of their power, is it possible, either that Burke himself would have persevered in their production, or that others would have kindled with emulation?

'In our opinion, it is clearly impossible; and we ascribe, in a considerable degree, to the introduction of the practice of contemporaneous reporting, the sudden and extraordinary growth of parliamentary eloquence, which dates from the latter part of Lord Chatham's career. We do not conceive that there is anything extravagant in attributing so important an effect to a cause which may seem at first insignificant. It is precisely the effect of the invention of alphabetical writing on the primitive literature of Greece; the effect of the introduction of paper on prose composition; and the effect of the art of printing on learning in general.

'Till speeches began to be reported in detail and contemporaneously, the public at large was almost wholly uninformed of what passed within the walls of parliament. So long as it was a breach of privilege to publish what was there uttered, it is very clear, that few men would strain their minds to the utmost reach, in the highest efforts of the art of speaking well.

'It is only therefore, we repeat, since the practice of contemporaneous reporting grew up in England, that parliamentary eloquence has been placed, in that country, upon its present improved footing. Nothing before it of the kind, in the history of the intellectual world, can be compared with it. We apprehend that the careful observer, who shall go into the House of Commons, listen to the speeches (unpremeditated as to language and form) of the most distinguished members, follow the discussion to a division the same evening, and the next morning at breakfast find those speeches reported faithfully in three or four newspapers, of which about thirty thousand copies have been struck off and are in circulation, will admit, that he has witnessed a spectacle of intellectual, political, and mechanical power combined, such as is nowhere else to be found.' pp. 428, 429.

Art. V. *The Hecuba of Euripides*, from the Text, and with a Translation of the Notes, Preface, and Supplement of Porson; Critical and Explanatory Remarks, partly original, partly selected from other Commentators; Illustrations of Idioms from Matthiæ, Dawes, Viger, &c. &c.; a Synopsis of Metrical Systems; Examination Questions; and Copious Indexes. By the Rev. J. R. Major, A.B. Trin. Coll. Camb. 12mo. pp. 124. Price 5s. London, 1827.

AMONG the numerous publications which have of late years issued from the press, under the superintendence of the scholars of this country, and designed for the promotion of

the study of Greek literature, this unostentatious volume is entitled to honourable notice. It would be sufficiently attractive to the student, if it were merely an English version of the *Hecuba* as edited by Porson; but besides this, it comprises so many valuable additions, and is executed with so much judgement, that we should fail in our duty, were we to omit to recommend it to the young scholar as admirably adapted to promote his improvement in the department to which it relates. The criticisms and canons of Porson are here presented to him in a form more accessible and inviting than that in which they originally appeared, and are accompanied with remarks confirmatory and illustrative of their truth and value, and occasionally supplying their deficiencies. The Supplement is incorporated with the Preface in this Translation, and no passages of the least importance are omitted. The observations of Porson in his Notes to the Tragedy are given by Mr. Major with precision and conciseness, accompanied with numerous extracts from other Commentators, and, in some instances, with suggestions of the Editor.

In elucidating difficulties, neither Porson himself, nor the critics of the Porsonian school, have done all that could be expected from them as editors. Blomfield's Glossaries on *Æschylus* are a contribution which cannot fail of being highly appreciated by Grecians in the novitiate of their studies; but, excellent as they are, they do not supply all that must be considered as *desiderata*. A correct text is unquestionably of the first consideration; and therefore, the emendations which a classic receives from the labours of the critic whose sagacity and practised skill enables him to pronounce on the character of conflicting readings, are highly valuable. But we cannot slightly estimate those critical remarks which have rather for their object to elucidate the meaning and spirit of an author. In this latter department, we are disposed to consider many editors as deficient. It may be very proper to notice varieties in the orthography, and to adjust the arrangement of words; but if, in addition to these verbal improvements, the editors of the ancient classics would enable us, by the application of a more generous criticism, to understand more clearly the meaning, and to appreciate more correctly and fully the beauties of the authors which they undertake to revise and reform, we should be glad to be still more deeply indebted to them. At present, our obligations are less weighty and less extensive than we could wish them to be.

Though Mr. Major does not entirely answer to our requisition, he has advanced beyond many of his contemporaries in the fulfilment of such a purpose as we contemplate. The extracts which he has inserted from Matthiæ's Greek Grammar,

will prove serviceable to the student. Of metres, a compendious view of the species in most frequent use in chorusses, is appended to the preface. A series of Questions, and two Indices, adapted to the points discussed in the notes and prefatory matter, are added at the end of the work.

As we cannot doubt of the acceptance of the present edition of the Hecuba, we shall be glad to receive from the judicious Editor, the three remaining Tragedies, executed on the same plan.

Art. VI. *Exposition of Psalm CXIX.*, as illustrative of the Character of Christian Experience. By the Rev. Charles Bridges, B.A. Vicar of Old Newton, Suffolk. 12mo. pp. 474. Price 6s. London, 1827.

THE ‘*quid ferre recusent, quid valeant humeri*’, of Horace, may be applied to readers as well as authors. These are not the times for sending abroad bulky tomes of divinity; and Mr. Bridges’s duodecimo volume of expository remarks on the hundred and nineteenth Psalm is more in accommodation to modern taste, than the folio of Dr. Manton on the same portion of the Bible. Its limited size, however, is much less its recommendation than the value of its contents. It is an excellent manual of religion, plain, practical, and devotional, well adapted to assist humble and sincere Christians in pious exercises, and to promote their comfort in the improvement of their character.

We subjoin a specimen of the Exposition.

‘Verse 12. *Blessed art thou, O Lord; teach me thy statutes.*

‘The act of praise is at once our duty and our privilege. But in its highest exercise what does it amount to, when placed on the ground of its own merit? We clothe our ideas with magnificence of language, and deck them out with all the richness of imagery, and perhaps we may be pleased with our forms of praise; but what are they in his sight beyond the offering of a contemptible worm, spreading before its Maker its own mean and low notions of Divine Majesty? If a worm were to raise its head and cry, “O sun, thou art the source of light and heat to a widely extended universe”, it would in fact render a higher praise to the sun than we can ever give to our Maker. Between it and us there is some proportion,—between us and God, none. Yet, unworthy as the offering confessedly is, it is such as He will not despise. Nay more,—instead of spurning it from his presence, he has revealed himself as “inhabiting the praises of Israel”—intimating to us, that the service of praise is “set forth in his sight as incense”, and at the same time reminding us, that it should not be as the occasional visit of a guest, but the daily unceasing exercise of one at his own home. But the act of praise in its real character depends entirely upon the frame of the heart. In

the contemplative philosopher, it excites nothing but barren admiration. In the believer, it becomes a principle of practical comfort and encouragement. With him, the character of God is always an incitement to pray, and the attempt to praise gives strength and confidence to prayer. For in taking up the song of praise, can we forget who the Christian's God is, and what the revelation is which he has been pleased to give of himself in the gospel of his dear Son, divesting every attribute of its terrors, and shining before us in all the glory of his faithfulness and love? The ascription of praise—"Blessed art thou, O Lord"—leads us therefore to take up the prophet's song of triumph; "Who is a God like unto thee, that pardoneth iniquity, and passeth by the transgressions of the remnant of his heritage? He retaineth not his anger for ever, because he delighteth in mercy." Truly then he is "blessed" in himself, and delights to communicate his blessedness to his people. Therefore are we emboldened to ask for continual "teaching in his statutes", in the truths which he has revealed, and the precepts which he has enjoined, that we may "walk" with him "in love", and "be followers of him as dear children." There is evident ground of assurance in offering this petition, deduced from the tried character and faithfulness of God. "Good and upright is the Lord; therefore will he teach sinners in the way." And especially is this hope and expectation in approaching him as our covenant God—"Lead me in thy truth, and *teach me, for thou art the God of my salvation.* Teach me to do thy will, for thou art my God." It is a mark of a gracious frame, that we desire the Lord's teaching. Is it so, reader, with you? Surrounded as you are with the means of instruction, what progress are you making in the Lord's statutes? Is your knowledge increased since the last year? Have you a deeper acquaintance with the character of God,—with his holiness and love; with your own defilements, inconstancy, and weakness before him? Do you often frequent that "new and living way", by which at all times you may find a free access to his throne? that only way, by which the acknowledgement of praise can ever ascend with acceptance before him? "*By him*" (Christ) therefore let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually; that is, the fruit of our lips, giving thanks unto his name.—p. 26—28.

Art. VII. *Lectures on the History of the Christian Church, and on Nonconformity.* By Israel Worsley. 12mo. pp. 435, Second Edition.

THESE Lectures, we learn from the Preface, were delivered on the Sunday evenings during the winter of the years 1822-3, at Plymouth and Dock (now Devonport), to the Societies of 'Unitarian Christians meeting in those towns.' The first edition was disposed of immediately on its being published; and the second, revised and enlarged, is now before us. Mr. Worsley is known to our readers as the Author of a work on

the 'State and Changes of the Presbyterian Societies of England, and the Manufactures of Great Britain,' which was noticed in our Seventh Volume (N.S.) and as a zealous advocate of the doctrines professed by 'Modern Unitarians.' In the volume before us, he conducts the review of ecclesiastical history which its pages exhibit, in promotion of the cause to which his former labours were devoted. The picture which he has drawn of the Primitive Christian Church, is in many respects 'faithful,' but not in all. Its liberties he has well defined; but his account of its doctrines cannot be admitted to be a true one. The original record of those doctrines is still in existence; and the evidence of the New Testament is sufficient to establish the character of the tenets which he represents as errors, as being its most important verities. Speculative and crafty men but too extensively and fatally introduced innovations and made additions to the doctrines received and maintained by the first Christian communities; but the New Testament has not been adulterated by their corruptions, and it is equally now, as it was in the beginning, the source and the measure of Christian truth. We cannot, therefore, but regard the Author's labours as to a considerable extent perniciously misdirected, being in direct opposition to the cause to which the primitive ministers of Christianity consecrated their services.

Mr. Worsley informs his readers, that the proper divinity of Christ is a doctrine which originated in the philosophic schools of the Greeks at Alexandria;—that Plato had maintained an opinion very much like the doctrine of the Christian Trinity;—that Philo, a learned Jew of Alexandria, who became an early convert to Christianity, had been long a disciple of Plato, whose system of allegorising he applied to the learned doctrines both of Judaism and of Christianity;—and that this same Philo was the chief instrument of inducing the Eastern Church to receive the doctrine of the divinity of Christ, through the means of the philosophic logos. (p. 46—48.) That Philo was a convert to Christianity, is an entirely gratuitous assumption, which the Author has adopted from the late Dr. John Jones, who laboured much in the construction of this hypothesis, without possessing the materials necessary to give it a solid foundation. That the proper divinity of Christ originated with the philosophising Christians of Alexandria, is a supposition to which, as readers of the New Testament, we can give no attention. We can scarcely believe that Mr. Worsley himself will ascribe to Jesus Christ the imitation of Platonic philosophers, or the adoption of the doctrines and language of their schools; and we leave him to find out and assign the reasons for the use of the expressions which our Lord has intro-

duced into the commission which he gave to the Apostles when he charged them, "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." We must have better reasons, than those which Mr. Worsley would have his readers deem satisfactory in explanation of the proem to John's Gospel.

' These Platonic philosophers eagerly embraced the idea, that Christ was this word or wisdom of God; thus exalting their honoured Lord, by making him to be derived in a miraculous way from the Great Supreme, and being in fact his wisdom or his mind. It is not possible on the present occasion to give any thing like a tolerable idea of the different ways in which this subject was handled by them, and the manner in which the meek prophet of Nazareth was described, according as they annexed more or less of this Platonic system to the simple doctrine of the Cross. It appears that this error had sprung up before John wrote his Gospel; for, in the beginning of it, he contends against this opinion, of Christ being the Logos or Word of God. He affirms that the Logos or Word, by which all things were made, was not a being distinct from God, but God himself, that is, an attribute of God or the divine wisdom, which was co-eternal with himself. *In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and the word, or wisdom which formed the world, was no other than God himself; who made a divine display of himself by Christ Jesus, visiting his own people, whom he had chosen to receive the revelation of his own will,* pp. 46, 47.

John contends against the opinion of Christ being the Logos or Word of God!! So we are told by Mr. Worsley; to whom, after this strange assertion, we may readily concede the faculty of assigning to any set of words such meaning as may be most in favour of any system or notion which the writer may be inclined to publish, even if the words themselves should be so selected and so arranged as to convey obviously and positively a sense the very reverse. Let our readers conceive, if they can, that a holy Apostle, chosen and endowed with heavenly inspiration by the Great Head of the Church, for the purpose of instructing the world in Divine truth, would set himself against the errors of false teachers, and commence his exposure of them by adopting their expressions, and making such use of them as those very teachers themselves could not refuse to sanction, and must have been gratified to find employed on such an occasion. For we are quite sure, that, if it were the intention of a writer to prevent his readers from attributing to his sentences a coincidence in their meaning and terms with those of an opponent; he would be considered as having signally failed, if he had not constructed them more cautiously than are the introductory portions of John's Gospel. ' Plato maintained that there was a first and principal God,

‘whom he called the good; that the word or wisdom of this God emanated from him, and formed the second in the Divine Nature!—These Platonic philosophers eagerly embraced the idea, that Christ was this word or wisdom of God.’ And John, contending against this error, states, that “in the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.” Is this refutation or confirmation of the error? And then, to complete the consistency, “The Word was made of flesh,” is to be rendered, ‘God made a Divine display of himself by Jesus Christ.’ If the language of the New Testament is to be interpreted in this manner, Unitarianism cannot be regarded as offering to our acceptance a very rational philology.

Again, on the phrase, ‘The Son of God,’ by which the Messiah is designated in the New Testament, Mr. Worsley remarks: ‘a title that is given to his disciples as well as to himself, and shews what idea is to be entertained respecting his nature and his character as a son.’ p. 84. Does the Author mean to say, that the title is applied in both instances in the same manner, and is equally limited or extensive in its import in each? Is ‘Paul, or John, the Son of God,’ a predication of the same kind and meaning as ‘Jesus the Son of God?’ We cannot conceal our surprise that such an averment should be hazarded. Strange, that a man so keen-eyed in detecting ecclesiastical impositions, should be so blind to corruptions of a still worse character.

In ecclesiastical communities which are the most corrupt and the most remote from the primitive models, we have seen that the most hardy pretences can be made to Apostolical conformity, connected with the loudest boasts of Apostolic authority. In the established Church of England, if we are to credit the assertions of her advocates, and take our estimate of her character from the eulogies of her partizans, there is so close a resemblance in her offices and ministers to the services and ministers of the primitive Christian churches, that, if the dead should rise, and the ancient worshippers of the Apostolic times were to become attendants on the established Church, they could scarcely be sensible of any change. But, were the ministers of the Apostolic churches ranged alongside of the English Bishops, and the whole state and relations of the one compared with those of the other, the difference would not be less striking than it is real. The primitive pastors of the first churches, the bishops who had known the Apostles and received their instructions, would repel with astonishment the pretensions of the mitred Lords of Cathedrals to be their representatives. It is perfectly surprising, that the egregious folly which such pretensions include, can ob-

tain currency with any persons to whom the New Testament is an accessible and open book. Christian worship is a very simple and reasonable service; and the institutions and ministers which originally were appointed for its support, were few and simple; altogether unlike the secularities of State Incorporations. On this subject, Mr. Worsley can write correctly enough.

‘ Is it necessary that I point out to you, my hearers, the strong lines of difference between this primitive Church, which for three centuries preserved its independence amidst affliction and persecution, and that which in this country is called the Church established by law? The Church in that day was simply an assembly of pious men, met to worship God in the name of Christ Jesus: now it is a privileged corporation, marked by the highest worldly honours, endowed with a large proportion of the wealth of the kingdom, grasping all the offices of honour and of wealth in its covetous hands, and bound together by canons and rubrics and articles and creeds, none of which are found in the Gospel.—The Bishops then were plain men, set each over his own society, for the purposes of pious instruction and serious devotional exercises; and they were the only clergy. We have Bishops still, but how unlike those! They are, for the most part, branches of the most wealthy families in the kingdom, controlling the ecclesiastical concerns of some hundreds of parishes, sitting in the parliament house to make laws for the kingdom, driving from county to county in splendid carriages, receiving immense revenues, and in general exercising no spiritual functions, and distinguished by a handsome head-dress, flowing gowns and cassocks, lawn sleeves, long bands, and little silk aprons; while under them are those that are called clergy, holding a long rank of dignities in the Church, and living upon millions of the people’s property.—The creed of the early days was, *Believe in the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved*: the creed of the present day consists of some hundreds of propositions, so loosely put together, that they who profess to believe it, hold very different and even contrary opinions.—If a man was then powerfully impressed with the truth of the gospel, it was his pleasure to contribute a small portion of his wealth to support a common worship: but now, whether he believe it or not, he is forced to make the profession of it, by furnishing funds for its support; and if he happen to be of a different opinion, he must become a hypocrite in the name of Christ, in order to enjoy the dignities and the circulating revenues of the State.’ pp. 56, 57.

It would be interesting and instructive to examine the historical records of the country, for the purpose of ascertaining the manner in which the political influence of its highest ecclesiastical dignitaries has been exercised. On a case of blood, the Bishops withdraw from the Peers, it being deemed unseemly for men of their vocation to sit in judgement and to vote on the life or death of man; but, in cases involving most exten-

sively the rights, the peace, the happiness, the lives of mankind, they sit, and judge, and vote. The Prime Ministers of England have always reckoned on being supported by the bench of Bishops in all the wars upon which they have entered. Apologies and defences are ever ready for the worst cases that may need them. But we would ask, whether it is conceivable, that the ministers of the churches of Christ were ever intended by their Lord to take their places by the side of men who decree the bloodshed of thousands, and to give their voice for human slaughter? The conduct of Bishops as Lords of Parliament, would be a sad illustration of their Apostolical pretensions.

The following passage would seem to require some notice in correction of its statements.

‘The same ignorance would surely have continued to overspread this now enlightened and happy island of ours, had not the Reformation taken place amongst our forefathers; and I will add, because I shall have occasion to prove it in a future lecture, had not a large proportion of its inhabitants dissented from the corrupt system of Christianity which was then established by law; had they not thus entirely disencumbered themselves of the fetters with which the people had been bound, and, by the free exercise of the understanding, and the bold and determined tone which they assumed, wrought out for us the liberties, both civil and religious, which we now enjoy, and induced that high state of intellectual eminence to which our nation has been raised above every other nation of the earth: for I doubt not that I can show, that both our civil and our religious liberties as well as our general prosperity as a nation, may call the Nonconformists, Father.’ pp. 93, 94.

‘Corrupt system of Christianity,’ is a phrase which the readers of Mr. Worsley’s book will have learned to consider as descriptive of the religious doctrines to which his own Unitarianism is opposed, and against which he so vigorously exerts his powers. To what persons then would he direct us, as the large proportion of the inhabitants of this country who dissented from this system; and what is the date of their secession? It is evident that the reference is to the Nonconformists. But nothing can be more remote from fact, than Mr. Worsley’s statement so explained. The Nonconformists did *not* dissent from the system of Christianity which was then established by law. They were never in opposition to that system. They were most cordial in their belief of the doctrines of the Church, and most determined in the support of them. Nothing could be more the object of aversion to the Nonconformists, than the religious tenets to which the Author professes his adherence. They did not go off from the Church under the conduct of a Unitarian or Socinian leader. They never contended for an

alteration of essential principles in the National Church; nor, when they had withdrawn from her communion, did they profess doctrines of faith different from those which they had maintained when within her pale. It is altogether an erroneous representation of their dissent, to describe it, as the Author has done in the preceding passage, as resulting from a dislike to the doctrines of the Church. The system of Christianity patronised by the Church, and established by the State, was the Christianity of the Nonconformists.

Nor is it more correct to represent the Nonconformists as the originators of our civil and religious liberties. This title designates the men who were placed in separation from the Church by the Act of Uniformity in 1662. But, in whatever veneration we may hold them, and whatever may be the extent of our obligations to them, they are not to be produced as either the teachers or the models of a correct and pure religious freedom. In the reasons of their nonconformity, there are to be found pleas of conscience which command our respect and approval; and the men are hallowed to our feelings by their sufferings; but those pleas do not include the principle which is essential to the just and complete assertion of the rights of religious profession. The leaders of the Nonconformists would have satisfied themselves with the grant of concession to their scruples in respect to the ritual of the Church, the patronage and control of which they were quite willing should be vested in the supreme civil authority of the kingdom. If they refused their assent and consent to all and every thing contained in the book of common prayer, they admitted the authority from which it proceeded, and they never objected to a state religion, and to restrictive and coercive laws. They solicited a comprehension which would have comprised themselves as members of an ecclesiastical incorporation, which, whatever might have been its benefits to them, was a denial of liberty to others. And they, it must be remembered, at the very time that the discussions were in course, on which their comprehension in the Church was pending, opposed themselves to the religious freedom of other men. Between the Nonconformists and Mr. Worsley, there could have been no agreement in primary Christian doctrines; nor would they have accorded in the principles of religious freedom. That our obligations, and the obligations of all persons to whom human rights and human happiness are objects of attachment and solicitude, are great to the Nonconformists, we not only cheerfully and gratefully acknowledge, but we are equally disposed to defend the claims which may be asserted on their behalf. But Mr. Worsley has certainly not

appreciated or correctly stated those claims in the preceding extract.

We may, however, avail ourselves of Mr. Worsley's representations for the purpose of remarking, that the persons whom he describes as the fathers of our civil and religious liberties, were the supporters of a religious system to which his own doctrines are most opposed. They were Trinitarians; they were Calvinists; they would have shrunk from the denial of the divinity of Christ, the doctrine of the atonement, and the associated tenets which Unitarians have blotted out from their creed. Now of these men the Author declares, that they had 'entirely disencumbered themselves of the fetters with which the people had been bound.' He attributes to them 'the free exercise of the understanding,' and ascribes to 'the bold and determined tone which they assumed,' the working out of the liberties, both civil and religious, which we now enjoy, and that high state of intellectual eminence which distinguishes our nation. These are his representations and eulogy; and they at least take out the Nonconformists from the application of his remarks elsewhere, that—

'It cannot but be seen by every one who will peruse the history of his race, that the spirit with which the defenders of false systems of theology have been inspired, has been the same in all ages. They will enforce their own views with rigour; they will call in persecuting measures to secure them; but forbid enquiry into other systems.' p. 389.

Abundant proof is therefore afforded by the circumstances to which Mr. Worsley has referred with so much approving warmth, that the doctrines avowed by religious professors are not in themselves to be deprecated as the causes of intolerance. Heterodoxy in Poland or Geneva may be oppressive, and orthodoxy in England or America may be harmless in respect to the present interests of men. The Author very truly remarks, that though

'Other causes may have co-operated to induce the ignorance and licentiousness that overwhelmed, first the Church and then the people; the main cause, and that which drew on all the others, was the union of the Church with the State.' p. 92.

This is the primary source of the evil—

*'Hoc fonte derivata clades
Inque patres populumque fluxit.'*

Separate religious profession from civil power, and you apply the correct and ample remedy for the removal and prevention

of one of the greatest miseries which have afflicted and destroyed mankind;—you place men in the relation in which they should stand to each other, and to their Maker;—you open to truth the course in which its free advances will be sure and progressive, till its claims shall be universally acknowledged, and its final success will be celebrated;—and you restore and perpetuate the order and the means included in the appointments of Jesus Christ, the head of the Church, whose ‘kingdom is not of this world.’

Art. VIII. *Memoirs of the Life of the Right Honourable George Canning.* In two Volumes. Sm. 8vo. pp. 777. London. 1828.

‘**L**ODGINGS to let’—has at length been taken down from the windows of Downing-street, and the official apartments of that political caravanserai have, for the present at least, found responsible occupants. It is strange and bewildering to look back from these times of transition and alternation, to that long period of parliamentary despotism, identified with our earliest recollections, when William Pitt was lord of the ascendant; the sultan, whose will was law, whose frown was fate, of the treasury-benches; the ‘Sir Oracle’ of the country gentlemen; and the *ultima spes* of that large, but lessening class of selfish and sagacious persons with whom the idea of innovation operates as a sort of moral and intellectual incubus, suspending all their faculties, and awakening all their fears. In evil hour for the idolaters of place and power, to the irrecoverable dismay of all the worshippers of infallibility, and to the utter astonishment of every firm and consistent statesman, of whatever party, ‘the pilot, who weathered the storm’ by running his ship among the breakers, quitted the helm just at that crisis of the danger when vigilance, skill, and dauntless energy were most required. The feeble administration of Mr. Addington, with the vacillations and disasters which beset the brief restoration of the ancient dynasty, were unfavourable to the resumption of that high tone of dictation, beneath which serviles and alarmists had been so long accustomed to cower. Lord Castlereagh made a spirited essay towards the re-establishment of the system, and, aided by an imperturbable temper, and an Irish promptitude at resorting to hair-triggers, kept friends and foes in tolerable order. But his death left the arena open; and the high talent, open challenge, and fair fighting of Canning, led the debates, giving an advantageous change to their character and quality. All these vicissitudes, aided by the operation of incidental circumstances, seem to have chang-

ed the aspect of things; to have broken the spell, thrown open the monopoly, brought parties to a level, and to something like a community of feeling on most of the great questions of national interest. Henceforward, the work of improvement will, we trust, go steadily forward. Some checks will be given to its progress, in proportion as narrow-minded or immoral men may be employed upon the machinery; but the impulse has been given, and the sagacious politician will prefer the safer alternative of directing and controlling its operations, to the tremendous hazard of an attempt to arrest its course.

For much of this, we are indebted to Mr. Canning. He was not formed by nature for a servile and shuffling 'policizer'; and hence it was, that the few excursions he made into the regions of intrigue, succeeded worse with him than with any other man. There was a high and honourable feeling about him that resiled from the alliance with meanness and degradation, even while an evil influence led him astray. As a debater, the consciousness—in him a dignified, not a coxcombical sentiment—of intellectual power, with the singular readiness and elasticity of his mind, rendered him sometimes too daring, and made him a not always safe defender of equivocal measures. He was fond of making concessions in argument, and then converting those very concessions into an *a fortiori* urgency of his main assault; a manœuvre which has this great defect, that, although, if it succeed it may be highly advantageous, if it fail, it is scarcely possible to recover the false step. Wit, of that ready sort which seizes, with prompt glance, every lapse of the opponent, and presses into its service all the sources of the ridiculous, he had at command; and he managed the common-places of debate with a felicity that converted them into efficient auxiliaries.

'The principles of Mr. Canning will be variously appreciated: some will denounce them as illiberal and despotic; others will admire them as the perfection of political virtue. But of his talents, and his consecration of those talents to what he considered the real prosperity of his country, there can be but one opinion: and whatever may be thought of his policy, it is certain that he was swayed by no inveterate prejudices. He had sufficient tact to modify his measures by circumstances; and though a tory from pride as well as interest, he could occasionally range with the whigs, and support, in some very important particulars, popular rights, in opposition to aristocratic encroachments. His vacillations, and for which he has been severely censured by the violent of all parties, were not so much deviations from his original principles, as the expedients of the hour, the more surely to obtain their success and triumph. His political career, let it also be remembered, was impeded by the jealousies, the weaknesses, and the prejudices of the party with which he thought fit

to identify himself. Like the first lion, he had to paw himself out of the earth; and, unfortunately for his fame and his country's welfare, as soon as he had achieved his emancipation, and risen up to his proper bearing and being, in all the fine proportions of his natural majesty, the hand of death laid his glory in the dust; so that in truth, he was never permitted to become the presiding genius in the councils of his country, nor the guiding light of her destiny. When the decision of the throne and the voice of the people invested him with this high responsibility, his constitution, already broken, sunk beneath its weight. What he was, however, belongs to his country: to use the touching expressions of Burke, in his lamentation over his son, "he was a public creature;" and the British public ought to receive with gratitude whatever tends to make him known, to illustrate his character, and to endear his memory. It will be the province of history, after generations shall have passed away, to decide upon the questions, whether he was a great statesman and a true patriot, and whether he actually advanced or retarded the improvement of mankind.' vol. i. pp. 2, 3.

This discreet and well-written passage will at once relieve us from the necessity of entering on the dangerous and debateable ground of modern politics, and shew that the volumes before us are the production of an able writer. We opened them under the impression of a very allowable prejudice against books apparently got up to satisfy the demands of the moment; and we expected to meet with the average complement of dates and citations, plastered and trowelled together with a sufficient quantum of verbiage and margin. To our gratification, we have found a fair and workman-like production, well composed, interestingly illustrated, and written with talent and excellent feeling. The extracts are well-chosen, and supply, at once, gratifying specimens of Mr. Canning's eloquence, descriptive details of his life and character, and the best defence of his opinions and measures. It is, we believe, no secret, that Dr. Styles is the author; and he has done himself credit by the way in which he has executed a task, of which the difficulties are enhanced by its apparent ease.

We have no intention of doing any thing more, in the present article, than recommend a seasonable publication to the attention of our readers. As reviewers, we are politicians, not professedly, but only incidentally; and we have no disposition to break through our rule in the instance before us. Ample illustrations of Mr. Canning's talents as a speaker, writer, and statesman, will be found in these volumes; and we shall content ourselves with this general reference, and with a single additional extract of a very striking kind. It occurs among the details connected with Mr. Canning's fierce and unremitting opposition to the Fox and Grenville administration.

‘His active, determined, and powerful opposition had, from the commencement, rendered Mr. Fox’s regular attendance in his place necessary. Night after night his measures were assailed by the ex-secretary. He was dying, but no tenderness was shown him, and he could not be persuaded to abandon the post of duty. He neither spared himself, nor was spared by others. Alas! that the warfare of politics should be the worst species of deadly feud. But in the senate, or in the field, men devoted to their country must heroically fight her battles, and take the chance of war, either to triumph or fall in the conflict; and such was the doom of Pitt, of Fox, and of Canning. The cup goes round, and he that administers it to day, may be compelled to exhaust its very dregs to-morrow. Mr. Fox received his from no ignoble hand. Mind encountered mind in the struggle of principle, and the feeble frame alone yielded the victory to youth and constitutional vigour. There was one great man in Israel that died as “a fool dieth,” by a dastardly assassin. Canning was hunted out of life; and, if a future age shall make inquisition for his death, it will have to be told, that he was the victim of a mean, personal, and petty persecution. A faction aimed the deadly thrust amid the deep execrations of an insulted nation. It was not the sword;—*that* he could have braved, but it was the envenomed tongue; it was not the generous hostility of high and opposing principle; but it was the contemptible selfishness and pride which could not endure a superior intellect, except in a subordinate station. It was upstart rank, affecting to treat with supercilious disdain the man, whose talents it hated, and whose innate nobility cast a shadow upon adventitious distinctions; its ribbons spun from the loom of yesterday, and its heraldic bearings scarcely dry from the artist’s hands. Perhaps there was something retributive in this: “the measure that we mete to others, shall be measured to us again.”’ vol. ii. p. 43—45.

We hope that an extensive demand for this interesting work, may give the Author an opportunity for retouching and expanding. It wants but little to make it a standard book.

Art. IX. *Yorkshire Scenery*; or, Excursions in Yorkshire, with Delineations of some of the most interesting Objects. By E. Rhodes. Royal 8vo. pp. 175. Price 18s. London. 1826.

WE shrewdly suspect that there has been an error of calculation in the very commencement of this work. *Yorkshire Scenery*;—the first part, price eighteen shillings, comprising the particulars of a picturesque walk in the neighbourhood of Sheffield and Rotherham. It would be rather startling, if we were to sum up the cost of all Yorkshire at this rate. We would recommend Mr. Rhodes to reconsider his plan; to get rid of all unnecessary ‘dead weights,’ in the shape of volunteer etchings and attempts at fine writing; to be certain of his

points, chary of his praises, and to employ the cheap and ready processes of lithography. We are jealous of this method of multiplying drawings; and we contemplate with some apprehension, its possible effects on the higher branches of the graphic art; but, for undertakings like the present, it appears to be peculiarly adapted. It is emphatically *drawing*, and, when skilfully managed, renders a good sketch with admirable spirit and taste.

Mr. Rhodes is advantageously known to the public by his descriptions of Derbyshire scenery; and the present volume will confirm his title to the praise due to a pleasant companion and an agreeable writer. But he wants discrimination; he gives himself up too much to the vague effect of natural objects, and paints rather from the impulse of pleasurable feeling, than under the guidance of an accurate judgement and an artist's exercised eye. He might study Gilpin with profit. Not that the Vicar of Boldre is altogether a safe model, but he was distinguished for some of those qualities in which the present Writer strikes us as deficient. Gilpin, as a professor of the picturesque, exhibits some talent, more coxcombry, and still more charlatanism. He had, as we think, far less taste than tact. We seek in vain for traces of that fine enthusiasm which animates nature's true lover, or for the severe and satisfying discernment and decision that approve the man consummate in Art. He drew admirably, but on false principles. There is a spirit and dash about his handling, that gratifies the eye in spite of its want of substance and definition. His effect is good, but his lights are often multiplied and intersecting, while his general effect is confused and uncertain. It was in bad taste, to give specific views, professing at the same time to alter and adapt them in conformity to certain canons by which nature was in future to be regulated and admired. Nor was it in the exercise of a sounder judgement, that he substituted for expressive outline, characteristic detail, and harmonizing shade, an artificial combination of incoherent shadows, and an idle tracery of unmeaning scratches. At the same time, amid all his affectation, and all his unseasonable systematizing, there were glimpses of better taste. He knew how to pick up and dress out a good episode. He had an eye for accident; his accessories are frequently well managed; and he has observed and described with much felicity, many of those minor incidents which escape the unskilful or unpractised eye.

The principal objects of Mr. Rhodes's first Yorkshire excursion, were Roche Abbey and the castles of Tickhill and Conisbrough, with incidental notices of town and village, hill and dale, stream and standing pool. We cannot accompany Mr.

Rhodes in his walk, but we shall make room for a specimen of his talent for description, which, saving a little touch of the magniloquent, is of a very respectable order.

‘ I well recollect this view of Rotherham church, when it was even more beautiful and more picturesque than it now is, particularly when seen from the western side of the river between the bridge and the canal. The space occupied by the stream of the Don is here of magnificent dimensions, and it is often filled even to its utmost limits. At the time to which I particularly allude, from the weir nearly half way downward to the bridge, a row of lofty elms interposed a thick screen of foliage. A jutting roof, and here and there a chimney top, were seen through openings amongst the branches: over these, wreaths of light and almost transparent smoke, rising from the dwellings below, united and harmonized the various masses, and on an elevated knoll beyond, the north and west fronts of the church, thrown into perspective, displayed the whole of their architectural grandeur. The humbler dwellings that intervened between the river and the higher parts of the town, were excluded from the picture, and all that was beheld was full of beauty. A little on the right, a weir, thrown obliquely across the river, is a good feature in this part of the landscape. The water, dashed into foam, rushes impetuously over it, and circles into a thousand eddies in the capacious basin below, from whence it flows along the ample space that forms its channel in limpid shoals and sparkling rapids. Above the weir, the eye follows the stream along the line of the Don, to where the Rother pursues its loitering course through the flat meadows of Bradmarsh, and falls into the Don at Bow-bridge. The plantations at Moorgate, and the bold eminence on which Boston Castle stands, occupy the left side of this rich landscape, and the woods of Canklow cover the remoter parts of the hills, and fill up the distance.

‘ I have sometimes beheld this scene with a pleasure bordering on enthusiasm, particularly when the declining sun, emerging from the clouds that for a time had overshadowed his splendour, poured a flood of radiance on all opposing objects, and lighted up the rich architecture of Rotherham church with a bright but mellow lustre. I have likewise seen it under far different effects—when the river not only filled up its capacious channel, but overflowed its banks, and trespassed far beyond its ordinary bounds—when boats and barges navigated some of the streets of the town. Those who know any thing of the town of Rotherham, will easily conceive how grand the scene must have been under such circumstances, when beheld from this particular place. On one occasion which I well remember, a vessel of many tons burthen was torn by the force of the stream from its moorings, a little below Bow-bridge, hurried rapidly down the river, and precipitated over the weir with a tremendous velocity. The body of the vessel, as it passed over this artificial barrier, displayed the whole of its bulk, for a moment only—the next, it disappeared like a ship suddenly engulfed amidst the turbulent waves of the ocean, and its deck was no longer seen. A part of the mast rose over the surging flood, which served to point out the place of the wreck; and

when the waters subsided, the hull of the vessel appeared, and it occupied for years afterwards the spot where it had foundered.'

Bating the *ship engulfed amidst the turbulent waves of the ocean*, this is not amiss; and there is a good deal that is still better.

We cannot compliment the decorations. We question their judicious selection; we are sure that they might have been more interestingly managed. The best is a view of Conisbrough Castle from Hofland.

Art. X. *Oriental Observations and Occasional Criticisms*, more or less illustrating several hundred Passages of Scripture. By John Callaway, late Missionary in Ceylon. 12mo. pp. 92. Price 2s. 6d. London. 1827.

THERE are few countries of the East in which an intelligent traveller, and especially a resident, would not be struck with numerous coincidences between the customs and usages of the people and those which are the subject of reference in the sacred history. Persia, India, Arabia, Egypt, exhibit the same forms of society, the same domestic constitution, as well as the same scenery, natural phenomena, and productions, as they did two or three thousand years ago,—when Ahasuerus reigned at Susa, Hiram traded to Ophir, or Midianite caravans went down into Egypt. We cannot admit that the truth of Scripture history stands in need of any additional evidence; but the obscurities of biblical phraseology are greatly removed by an acquaintance with oriental customs, and the student of Scripture finds his pleasure and instruction by this means considerably enhanced. Mr. Callaway remarks, that 'what strikes one, may escape the observation of another;' and he has therefore contributed, in this modest form, his contingent of information, derived from a ten years' residence in Ceylon. The notes are for the most part brief, and, when suggested by the Author's personal observation, interesting and to the purpose. The following are specimens:

'Psalm cxxiii. 2.—Behold, as the eyes of servants look unto the hand of their masters, and as the eyes of a maiden unto the hand of her mistress; so our eyes wait upon the Lord our God, until that he have mercy upon us.

'The Easterns direct their servants very generally by signs—even in matters of consequence. The Cingalese intimate their wish for a person to approach, by bending the finger with the point towards the person wanted, as if to seize him—quite in the opposite direction to the English way of beckoning. To depart is signified by a side nod; and a frown by a front one.—One Racub, a vizier, in conversation with an ambassador, was whispered by his high provost, and denoted

his answer by a slight horizontal motion of the hand. The vizier resumed an agreeable smile; and when the conversation ended, the significancy of the token was dreadfully explained, by nine heads cut off and placed in a row on the outside of the fort gate.' p. 42.

'Isaiah, xlvii. 13.—Let now the astrologers, the star-gazers, the monthly prognosticators, stand up and save thee from these things that shall come upon thee.

'A *litta*, or almanack of the Cingalese, often runs for only a month. It contains the changes of the moon—the lucky and unlucky periods—directions about cultivation—the special times of worship at the temples—and eclipses, if any.—The chief *pōya*, or day of devotion, is at the full moon.

'Isaiah, xlix. 22.—They shall bring thy sons in their arms (margin, *bosom*), and thy daughters shall be carried upon their shoulders.

'So the Cingalese and Hindoos often carry their children; but generally as in chap. lxvi. 12, "*borne upon her sides*." I have seen two Malabar children, in two cloths, suspended at the ends of a stick, and carried like any other burden.' p. 52.

'Ezekiel, ix. 2.—One man among them was clothed with linen, with a writer's ink-horn by his side. (Margin, *upon his loins*.)

'The Cingalese keep the *stylus* in a case stuck into the foldings of the cloth wrapped round the waist. The case is commonly a piece of cane seven or eight inches long, about the bigness of one's little finger. About it is a cord, with a noose to put over the head of the *stylus*, to keep it from slipping out. A knife is often furnished with a *stylus*, as an English one may be with a cork-screw. One of these is in the Writer's possession.

'Ezekiel, ix. 4.—And the Lord said unto him, Go through the midst of the city, through the midst of Jerusalem, and set a mark upon the foreheads of the men that sigh, and that cry for all the abominations that be done in the midst thereof.

'“The different sects of Hindoos, make the distinguishing mark of their sect upon the forehead, with the powdered sandal-wood, or the clay of the Ganges.”—Malabar people in Ceylon may be often seen marked in this way.

'Ezekiel, xxxii. 27.—And they shall not lie with the mighty that are fallen of the uncircumcised, which are gone down to hell with their weapons of war; and they have laid their swords under their heads.

'An ancient warrior's weapons were buried with him. The Cingalese sometimes denote rank this way.—Some trinket in modern times is occasionally put in a coffin, to signify the profession and rank of the deceased,—as a chalice for a bishop. An ecclesiastical historian writes,—“The archbishop died about the same time; and, poor man! was buried in sacerdotal habits with two cups, and with all the honours usually paid to the archbishops of Prague. One hundred and sixty years after, his remains, little more than cups, rags, and red hair, were removed to make room for the corpse of a Jesuit.” pp. 56, 57.

At page 14, there occurs a comment on Numb. xxv. 8, the connexion of which with the text we are at a loss to discover. The note, in such a reference, has neither propriety nor meaning, and must, we imagine, have been appended to the passage by mistake.

ART. XI. 1. *The Scripture History, from the Creation to the Birth of Christ*; with Notes, Historical and Explanatory, and a set of Chronological Tables: for the Use of Schools and Families. By Andrew Thomson. 12mo. pp. 382. Price 5s. 6d. Bristol. 1826.

2. *The Scripture History of the New Testament*; with occasional Notes and Illustrations, and a Geographical Index: for the Use of Schools and Families. By Andrew Thomson. 12mo. pp. 174. Price 2s. 6d. London. 1827.

CONSIDERABLE pains have evidently been bestowed upon these volumes, the design of which cannot be too highly commended. They comprise an outline of the Scripture History in the form of Question and Answer. This mode of instruction has its advantages; but, to be effective as an exercise of the mind, the answer should in general be supplied by the pupil. We must confess that we do not otherwise perceive what is gained by breaking the narrative into a dialogue between Q. and A. It is impossible that Mr. Thomson could design the answers to be learned *memoriter*. The following is a specimen:—

‘ Q. How did Moses and Aaron open their commission to Pharaoh?

‘ A. They said unto him, “ Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, Let my people go, that they may hold a feast unto me in the wilderness:” but Pharaoh treated their message with contempt, and ordered his servants to deal more rigorously with the Israelites.

‘ Q. How did they endure this severity?

‘ A. Having in vain appealed to Pharaoh, they murmured bitterly against Moses and Aaron.

‘ Q. What was the religious state of the Hebrews at this period?

‘ A. They had forsaken the true God for the gods of the land; and, rather than depend on the arm of Jehovah, preferred their slavery in Egypt.

‘ Q. How were Moses and Aaron encouraged under these unfavourable appearances?

‘ A. They believed in God, who assured them of the deliverance of Israel, after He had smitten Egypt with all his wonders. “ And Moses spake so unto the children of Israel: but they hearkened not for anguish of spirit, and for cruel bondage.”

‘ Q. What means were subsequently used with Pharaoh?

' *A.* Moses and Aaron again went to him; and being asked for a miracle, Aaron cast down his rod, which became a serpent. The magicians, Jannes and Jambres, however, did the same with their enchantments, but Aaron's rod swallowed up their rods.

' *Q.* What resulted from Pharaoh's unbelief?

' *A.* The Lord hardened his heart, and he refused to let the people go. Wherefore the Lord smote Egypt with ten plagues—all the waters of Egypt became blood—frogs infested the houses, beds, ovens, and kneading troughs, throughout the land—all the dust of the land became lice upon man, and upon beast—swarms of flies were sent, which devoured the Egyptians—all the cattle died—all the people, and the magicians also, were smitten with sore boils—a dreadful storm of thunder and hail was sent, which smote all that was in the field, both man and beast, and every herb and every tree—locusts of an extraordinary kind followed, and ate up every thing which the hail had left—a darkness that might be felt, confined the Egyptians to their dwellings for three days—and lastly, all the first-born of man, and of beast, were slain.

' *Q.* What tended materially to harden Pharaoh?

' *A.* The imitation of the circumstances of the first and second plagues, by the magicians?' pp. 69—71.

The Notes to the Historical Questions contain a great deal of useful illustration. In a work intended for schools and families, however, many of them must be regarded as of equivocal use, and some of doubtful propriety. That the Rabbins believed the tree of knowledge to have been the vine, is information adapted only to mislead. Hypotheses ought not to be mixed up with the sacred records. At page 31 occurs a note which better information with respect to the real nature of the Hindoo triads would have led the Writer to suppress. On what authority is it asserted that Elohim signifies the covenanters? To us, the information is new. That the worship of animals was instituted as symbolical of the Cherubim, is a mere reverie. These very notes, however, will shew that Mr. Thomson has been anxious, perhaps over anxious, to explain the sacred text; the intention of his work being 'to excite among the rising generation a taste for sacred literature, and to promote a more extensive acquaintance with the Bible.'

At the end of the *Scripture History* is given a chronological summary, digested from Prideaux, of the Jewish history subsequent to the time of Nehemiah. To this are subjoined some additional illustrations of the Biblical History, from the works of modern travellers and commentators; and a series of very useful Chronological Tables. To the *Scripture History* of the New Testament is appended a geographical Index. Such terms as 'the third hour', 'the preparation for the sabbath', &c.

should have been explained. Upon the whole, the volumes do credit to Mr. Thomson, and we shall be glad to find, that he is indemnified by the sale for the labour they must have cost him.

ART. XII. *Pilgrim Tax in India.* Facts and Observations relative to the practice of taxing Pilgrims in various parts of India, and of paying a Premium to those who collect them for the Worship of Juggernaut at the great Temple of Orissa. By J. Peggs, late Missionary at Cuttack, Orissa. 8vo. pp. 66. London. 1827.

HOW is it that we hear so much more of Popery in Ireland, than of Idolatry in India? Does geographical distance so soften down and obscure the greater evil, that it is actually mistaken for the less? The idea of elevating six millions of Roman Catholics to the same political level as their Protestant fellow-subjects, is regarded by many persons in this country with religious horror; while these same persons manifest a supreme indifference as to the direct patronage given by the British authorities in India to an execrable idolatry, by which scores of millions are held in infernal bondage. Were this government to salary the Romish priests of Ireland, that would be horrible: their maintaining Juggernaut's priests in splendour in another part of the world, matters not. Were the House of Commons to vote a grant towards building Romish chapels in the neighbouring island, the whole country would be in a flame. What is the system pursued in India?

'We have a body of Idol missionaries, far exceeding in number all the Christian missionaries, perhaps, throughout the world, going forth from year to year to propagate delusion, and proclaim, for the sake of gain, what, perhaps, not one among them believes, the transcendent efficacy of beholding—a log of wood; and all these, through a perversion of British humanity, regularity, and good faith, paid from year to year by the officers of a Christian and a British Government.'

In point of fact, the whole weight and authority of a political establishment are given to the popular idolatry. We earnestly recommend the perusal of these Facts and Observations to the consideration of the Christian public. In the words of Dr. Buchanan, 'the honour of our nation is certainly involved in this matter.'

Art. XIII. *Interesting Narratives from the Sacred Volume illustrated and improved*; shewing the Excellency of Divine Revelation, and the practical Nature of true Religion. By Joseph Belcher. 2 vols. Price 9s. London. 1827.

NOTWITHSTANDING the number of works now extant of this description, there still remained a desideratum which we think the work before us is well adapted to supply. Something was wanted less splendid and diffuse than the "Sacred Biography" of Dr. Hunter, and not quite so prolix and sermonizing as the "Scripture Characters" by Mr. Robinson. Mr. Belcher writes in a plain and easy style, and appears to have a happy talent for collecting the leading features of the narrative, elucidating what is obscure, and shewing with brevity and clearness the pious and practical bearing of every subject. The Narratives are fifty-two in number, of moderate length and varied interest, beginning with the account of Hagar, and ending with that of Onesimus. Upon the whole, we are satisfied that these volumes will prove a very acceptable addition to the list of modern works adapted for the family, or the village library.

To enable our readers to form their own opinion upon the style of these narratives, we give a short extract from each volume. The first is taken from 'The Foundling.'

'But alas! when three months had passed away, the parents of Moses, much as they loved him, found it impossible any longer to conceal their interesting babe. How then will the anxious mother act? A little basket that would float upon the water, is prepared and pitched within and without, and in this frail bark the infant is placed. Miriam, his sister, an interesting girl of about ten or twelve years old, is employed to place the ark on the water, and to watch at a little distance to see what will become of it.

'At the moment that the compassion of Thermutis is excited by the cry of the babe, little Miriam introduces herself to the notice of the princess; and hearing her remark, that the child belonged to one of the Hebrews, she proposed to call an Hebrew woman to nurse it. In almost every other instance, suspicion would have been excited; but this does not appear to have been the case upon this occasion, for the wisdom of Jehovah had planned, and his agency transacted the whole affair. No Egyptian could have imbued his tender mind with the knowledge of God, or have instilled the leading facts of revelation into his heart. "Mothers can do great things"; and there can be no doubt that the education Moses received from his mother was eminently useful to him in after days. While his mother is bountifully provided for by the royal house, Moses is loaded with the honours of the Egyptian court, and fitted for the important part he was hereafter to act upon the great theatre of life.

'O, what a source of gratitude was this to the mother of Moses!

she could never forget her obligations to God for his kindness to her son. What a tale of delight for his father, when he returned from the slavish toils of the day ! Nor can we suppose that Miriam, young as she was, could see all this unmoved. She would now probably learn the blessedness of trusting in that God whose wonderful works she afterwards celebrated in her immortal song.

‘ The narrative, as we have now viewed it, teaches us the doctrine of a particular providence which God exercises towards his own people : as Bishop Hall has remarked, “ when we seem most neglected and forlorn in ourselves, then is God most present, most vigilant.” This encourages us to put our trust in him under the darkest dispensations with which we may be visited ; seeing that what may appear to us the greatest trials, may end in our unspeakable happiness.

“ Ye fearful saints, fresh courage take ;
The clouds ye so much dread,
Are big with mercy, and shall break
In blessings on your head.”

‘ We learn further, that the enemies of God, even against their inclinations, may be constrained to do good to his people, and to contribute essentially to their happiness and usefulness. And, finally, we see the importance of infusing in early life the important truths of revelation into the minds of our children. That instruction was imparted to Moses in the years of infancy, which preserved him amidst the temptations of the Egyptian court, and fitted him for eminent usefulness in the Church of God. “ Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it.”’

Our second specimen is taken from the narrative entitled, ‘ The Awful Apostate.’

‘ But, although the wisdom of Christ, in the selection of his Disciples, has been almost universally admired, doubts seem to have rested on some minds, as to whether or not he shewed his knowledge of the human heart, in his choice of Judas as one of the companions of his social hours. It has been asked, did he not detect hypocrisy ? and was he not acquainted with the character of Judas ? In reply to this, let it be remembered, that Jesus came into the world claiming the honours due to Deity ;—that it was of vast importance to mankind, that his character should be fully known ;—that the real character of a man is not always exhibited in public life, but is only to be known by those who associate with him in his most private hours ; and that by the conduct of Christ in selecting an enemy to his government and claims, to be a companion in his retirement, he courted the most minute investigation, gave him an opportunity of speaking against him if he could, and has stopped the mouths of those who would publish him to the world as an impostor. The conduct of the apostate Judas, viewed in this light, presents a very powerful argument for the truth of Christianity.

‘ Let us accompany the traitor as he returns to the chief priests

and elders. He professes repentance, casts the money he had received on the floor of the temple, and utters in tones of agony, "I have sinned in that I have betrayed the innocent blood." Surely the world never afforded a more striking proof of the power of conscience;—never before declared so forcibly its own inability to impart happiness, or heard so decisive a testimony to the innocence of Christ's life! If Jesus had really been an impostor, Judas would have felt no remorse of conscience for having been the means of bringing him to justice; and every honest man would have applauded the deed. And had there been any deception practised on the part of Jesus, this Judas who had known him so well, had every possible inducement to disclose it. But when even *he* is compelled under such circumstances to declare him innocent, we may confidently rejoice in his character, and place unlimited confidence in his mission!

Art. XIV. *The Necessity of the Corporation and Test Acts maintained.* In a Brief Review of the "Statement of the Case of the Protestant Dissenters." 8vo. pp. 62. Murray. 1828.

WE congratulate our countrymen upon the honourable and animating result of the first debate that has for thirty-eight years taken place in the House of Commons upon a motion for a repeal of these Acts. We congratulate them less upon the triumphant numerical majority in favour of Lord John Russell's motion, than upon the manly, patriotic, and Christian spirit in which it was brought forward and supported, and upon the contemptible appearance assumed by its opponents. Bitterly, indeed, do we regret,—as we are persuaded every enlightened member of the community must do,—that one talented individual,—the foremost champion of a liberal commercial policy, the soundest thinker and ablest writer in the present Cabinet, a man who, with the people on his side, might have maintained the proud port of independence as a leader,—should, in the teeth of his own declaration, have proved a recreant to the cause of civil liberty, and have excited by his servile, trimming conduct, a laugh of surprise that will, we fear, haunt him to his death-bed.

Curious to know what ground would be taken by the opponents of the motion, we had sent for the pamphlet before us, which appears to have been put forth as a *feeler*. It is evidently the production of some clever underling, who has had his *cue* given to him, and who has prepared this specious view of the case as a brief for abler counsel and a directory for *voters*. Accordingly, it will be found in striking unison with the tenor of the speeches attributed by the newspapers to the unfortunate Mr. Huskisson and the less inconsistent Mr. Robert Peel. The Writer would deserve the praise of courtesy, if he were not

the smooth but determined advocate of injustice; and had he not falsified history to suit the purpose of his argument, we could almost have given him credit for honest sincerity. It may be only prejudice, that has led him to mistake the matter so grossly.

The pamphlet opens with the usual *caveat* against new-fangled opinions and projects of innovation, which always forms a preface to the defence of old injustice and obsolete error. The country had almost hoped, we are told, from the long silence of Dissenters on the subject of the Corporation and Test Acts, that '*the system* had been found to work conveniently 'for both parties,' and that the Dissenters were perfectly satisfied. Their present uneasiness is consequently attributed to the instigation of modern political teachers, and a few interested agitators.

Dissenters would have deserved this sneer, this cool insult, had they been quite as indifferent upon the subject as appears on the face of things. We cannot altogether defend their supineness; but they have been too confiding, and have been constantly misled. Their forefathers suffered themselves to be grievously humbugged by Sir Robert Walpole; and from that time to the present, with the exception of the abortive and ill-timed attempt made in 1789 and 1790, they have been always taught to believe that it was their interest and policy to wait. Those to whom the guardianship of their civil rights were entrusted, whether cajoled by sinister advice, or indisposed to make themselves obnoxious to the minister by stirring the question, quietly went to sleep at their posts. At the time of Lord Sidmouth's memorable attack upon our religious liberties, they did wake and stretch themselves,—but not until a stentorian voice had called fire in their ears, and the whole country was up before them. Still, pleas have not been wanting to deter Dissenters from making any application to Parliament for the full repeal of the penal statutes affecting them. The perpetual agitation of the Catholic Question has, no doubt, formed the principal hindrance to their claiming and obtaining a new hearing. On the one hand they have been told—'Yours, gentlemen, is the inferior grievance, and it would be injustice to 'the Catholics, to relieve you first.' On the opposite side it has been said: 'We should have no objection to open the 'doors to you, the Dissenters; but then, the Catholics will get 'in.' 'You must not grant the Catholics what they ask for,' said Lord Liverpool, 'because we must then in decency relieve 'the Dissenters.' 'You must not attend to the prayer of the 'Dissenters,' says Mr. Huskisson, 'because it would injure the 'cause of the Irish Catholics.' If the administration has been

favourable to the Dissenters, they have been told, that the agitation of the question of the Test Act would weaken the hands of their friends by alarming the Church. If unfavourable, they have been told to wait for better times. And now, they are taunted with not having applied sooner,—with having sent up only six petitions to Parliament in ten years. Their silence is construed into an assent and consent to the wisdom, justice, and convenience of ‘the system.’ Is this fair? Is this decent?

The present Writer goes, however, much further than this. He cannot perceive what restraint upon conscience these laws involve; nor is it possible, he says, to be discovered; a pretty strong indication of the flexibility of his own conscience. Mr. Burke thought otherwise; and although he may not rank so high as an authority with this gentleman, as Dean Swift, some respect is due to his declaration, that the enforcement of this test, ‘by wounding a man’s conscience, annihilated the God ‘within him.’ But the passage which the Writer cites with approbation from ‘the worthy and witty Dean,’—that model of purity, patriotism, and orthodoxy,—deserves to be extracted; not only as shewing what absurdity could once pass current under the sanction of a name, but as displaying the consummate ignorance of the present Writer,—well-informed as he appears on other topics,—on the subject he has undertaken to discuss.

“ ‘The word conscience,’ he says, “properly signifies that knowledge which a man hath within himself of his own thoughts and actions.” And, again: “Liberty of conscience is, properly speaking, no more than a liberty of knowing our own thoughts, which liberty no one can take from us.”’

Liberty of conscience, according to this exquisite definition, is enjoyed as perfectly in the Church of Rome as in the Church of England, or under any other ecclesiastical system. It cannot be invaded by priestcraft nor assailed by despotism. It is not lessened by persecution; for, even in prison or at the stake, a man has still the liberty of—knowing his own thoughts! It is clear, therefore, that the Test Act cannot infringe upon liberty of conscience.

Does this Writer know his own thoughts? We suspect that he cannot; and if so, his own liberty of conscience seems in jeopardy, according to this ‘proper’ signification of the phrase. The Dean goes on, however, to complain that the words had latterly obtained quite different meanings.

“ ‘Liberty of conscience is, now-a-days, not only understood to be the liberty of believing what men please, but also of endeavouring to propagate that belief as much as they can, and to overthrow the faith

which the laws have already established, and to be rewarded by the public for those declared endeavours; and this is the liberty of conscience which the fanatics are now openly in the face of the world endeavouring at with their utmost application.”

This Writer tells us, that he is willing to go much further than the Dean; a somewhat alarming intimation, but he does not mean what he says. He means just the reverse of going further,—not going quite so far; for he adds, that he is willing

‘to admit, that it is requisite to liberty of conscience, “properly speaking”, that a man may worship God after the form and fashion which seems to him most fit, so as he do not thereby shock the feelings or outrage the decency of Christian society. This is complete toleration, and this the Dissenters already most fully enjoy.’

If the Writer is really willing to admit this, it is unaccountable for what purpose the citation from the Dean as ‘an accurate observer of words and things’, is introduced; unless it be to give currency to a sentiment which he secretly applauds, but is ashamed to avow. Dean Swift was a determined foe to toleration; and had he been alive at the time of our Lord’s advent, he would have joined in the taunt—‘Have any of the rulers or of the Pharisees believed on him? but this people who know not the law, are cursed.’ Dean Swift would have supported the enforcement of the Five Mile Act and all the penal statutes against Nonconformists; and he belonged to a party who would gladly have repealed the Toleration Act itself. That such a man should be cited by the present Writer with approbation, speaks louder than all his willing admissions.

If, however, a man ‘*may* worship God after the form and fashion which seems to him most fit’, it is strange that he should be punished for so doing. This Writer, however, denies that penal laws are punitive, or that political restrictions operate as restraints upon the conscience. Were the Test Act enforced, he seriously affirms, no penalty would be incurred, ‘*unless* they (the Dissenters) continued in open violation of the law, which of course no man of common prudence would think of doing.’ Dissenters would merely have, in such case, to ‘give up all their employments under the Crown’, and that would be no penalty. It is no penalty, to be deprived of either honour or emolument, no penalty, to be debarred from them; no penalty, to be stigmatised as unfit to be employed in any office of trust; because penalty means a fine! Such is the despicable quibbling to which this Writer has recourse in defending a bad cause.

The Author’s main argument against the repeal of the Test Act is, that ‘the *invention* of the annual Indemnity Acts, while

'it gives us (the Church) security, practically affords indulgence to the Dissenters.' The penal statutes are 'certainly unrepealed, but they lie dormant; and *the only probability of their being had recourse to*, depends upon such a state of circumstances arising, as the Dissenters themselves have the means of preventing.' In a tone of half intimidation, half advice, he counsels the Dissenters 'not to awaken a suspicion which they do not deserve.' And in another place he explains himself more fully.

'The Corporation and Test Acts have been prepared as a shield ready to be caught up for our defence, whenever it may appear necessary; and it would be very weak and incautious policy, to give it into the keeping of those who would naturally be the least willing to restore it to us in the time of need.'

That is to say, if we understand the Writer, it would be very weak and incautious policy in *the Church*, to surrender the keeping of this shield to the *British Parliament*. The Legislature is not to be trusted with the guardianship of the Establishment! We like persons to speak out. 'If we give up this power to pinch the Dissenters when it may appear to us necessary, we shall never get it again'—such is the spirit of this declaration. 'Who can say', asks the Writer, '*that the facility with which the acts always might have been brought into force, may not have been the reason that it never was necessary to do so?*' After this, we could hardly have expected that he would have had the modest assurance to say:

'Let them (the Dissenters) ask themselves soberly, whether there be any real, substantial benefit they do not now enjoy, and which they would enjoy if the Corporation and Test Acts were obliterated from the statute-book. I can see none, except so far as the repeal of these acts might aid in the general destruction of the Church Establishment, in which case they might expect to regain some of the livings of which the Act of Uniformity deprived them; and of this desire I willingly exonerate them.'

The Writer's amiable candour and charity are signally conspicuous in thus hinting and disavowing a calumny in the same breath. Some of his simple readers may be ready to inquire, how, if the Church Establishment were to be involved in general destruction, the Dissenters could get hold of the livings? Waiving this, however, we must tender our thanks to the Writer for enabling us more clearly to see, what he affects to be unable to see, the substantial benefit of obliterating the unrepealed penal statutes. He has unwittingly furnished us with the most striking illustration of the inefficiency of the security provided by the invention of Indemnity Acts. He has himself

reminded us of the '*facility*' with which those sleeping statutes might at any time be brought into force, on the occurrence of any imaginary danger to the Church. He has told us that, 'whenever it may appear necessary', the Church intend to enforce the penal statutes against the Dissenters. He intimates, in a tone of semi-official authority, that we are upon our good behaviour; and counsels us, as we value the privileges already conceded to us, not to awake the *suspensions* of the Church. Now if a writer, who, how insignificant soever individually, may be supposed to speak the feeling of his party, can have the intolerable arrogance to threaten Dissenters in this way, on their petitioning Parliament for a repeal of these acts, what must we think of the real inclination of the opponents of the measure? Is it not high time that Dissenters should have some more efficient legislative protection, than this confessedly precarious suspension of the penal statutes by annual indemnity acts? If the Church cannot trust the Legislature, ought the Legislature to trust the Church? Admitting that there is no immediate danger that the dormant acts will be brought into force, is it not necessary that the possibility should be guarded against? Times may change; we may have another Harley or Bolingbroke at the helm of affairs; another Laud for primate. The war-cry of the Church is in danger, may be raised by an intolerant faction, and echoed by alarmists, till it shall be thought a necessary defence of the established Church, to pass no more indemnity acts. The present pamphlet supplies evidence that such danger is not wholly chimerical.

But independently of actual danger to the Dissenters, of the enforcement of these statutes under a High-church and Tory administration,—their continuance on the statute-book would be a serious grievance, were it only that it exposes Dissenters to the operation of the feelings avowed by this Writer; that it serves to give support and countenance to intolerant claims, and to keep alive ecclesiastical feuds, by leaving the Church in possession of the assumed right and dormant power to persecute. Rusty and unused as the weapons of persecution are, 'what shall we think', says this Writer, 'if the descendants of 'the ancient enemy of our house come to us, and urge us to 'throw them into the river?' And what shall we think, it may be replied, if you refuse to do it? Will it be said, that they are only kept hung up *in terrorem*? Why then keep them ready loaded? They may fall into other hands, or go off by mistake.

The cases of tangible grievance may be comparatively few, under the present system; but the moral influence of the exist-

ing statutes is pernicious in a thousand ways. Even this Writer can speak of the 'shocking profanation of the Lord's Supper' which it necessitates; the guilt and hypocrisy of taking the sacrament 'in remembrance of some preferment, rather than of 'the death of Christ', as Bishop Sherlock expressed it;—which guilt and hypocrisy, whether resting entirely with the individual who commits it, as the Bishop contends, or chargeable upon the Legislature,—at all events exist. And it deserves consideration, whether the apostolic warning, not to be partakers of other men's sins, may not concern some who would fain throw off the responsibility. Yet, while condemning the Test with affected abhorrence, this Writer actually apologises for it; and he would fain have us regard the notorious and constantly recurring profanation of the sacred rite, as a hypothetical sin, existing only in contingency.

'In considering the requisites of a test of religion, we should recollect that some solemnity is necessary, as affording, at all events, the best chance of producing the desired effect. A declaration of assent to the articles of the Church might be signed without producing almost any impression upon the mind beyond the moment in which it was done; and oaths of fidelity to the Establishment labour under the disadvantage of being liable to so loose and general an interpretation, that what one man would look upon as a direct violation of them, another might consider as only the fair exercise of his judgment, and the proper understanding of his oath. These suggestions are not made with a view of urging the impossibility of devising such a test as would be preferable to the present one. On the contrary, I not only believe it to be possible, but have no doubt, that if it were necessary to bring the Test Act into operation, it would be done. I trust, however, that there is no likelihood of the occurrence of this contingency—that there will be no occasion given for it.'

That 'a declaration of assent to the articles of the Church', is often signed 'without producing almost any impression upon 'the mind', is, we fear, but too true. The conduct of Dissenters proves, however, that they view such declarations in a rather more serious light than this Writer seems to own that those do who subscribe to them. Nothing, however, can be more absurd, than to represent the solemnity in question as having the force of an oath of fidelity to the Establishment. It is viewed in no such light by those who comply with the Test. It is a most equivocal test of churchmanship; for few Wesleyan Methodists would scruple to commune at the Parish Church. But 'insufficient', as Mr. Burke admitted, 'for the end which 'it was meant to accomplish', it is, in the case of the conformist, whose conscience is not violated by the test, a scandalous desecration of the ordinance, when exacted as a test of political qualification, and when the rite is celebrated with that view.

It is with admirable consistency that this Writer, while admitting the hypothetical possibility of devising a preferable test, labours to shew that some such solemnity is necessary,—that this is in fact the best.

We have already alluded to the operation of these laws in giving a statutory force to unsocial prejudices and sectarian animosities;—not, perhaps, in the minds of the better informed and pious members of the Establishment, but certainly in those of the vulgar, the little-minded, and the ignorant. That they have the effect of exasperating ecclesiastical differences by giving them a political character, will hardly be denied. An honourable member of the House of Commons, whose speech will be read with great interest, is reported to have remarked, that ‘the evil which emanates from these exclusive laws, does not so much consist in the actual deprivation of place which they inflict, as in the stigma and degradation which they fasten on those who suffer under them, and in the insolent superiority with which they arm those who are the orthodox opponents of all concessions to their fellow-subjects.’ The declaration was loudly cheered; and after such an admission of its truth, it would be a waste of words to attempt to prove it. ‘I would ask’, said the same speaker, ‘whether it is consistent with the principles of our holy religion, to make that ceremony, which ought to be the bond of human charity, the symbol of religious difference.’

‘It was of no avail’, remarked an honourable Baronet and County member, ‘to say, that the grievance to the Dissenters was not a substantial one. If they felt it to be one, substantial or imaginary, that was a sufficient cause for its removal.’ But is it indeed no grievance, as Mr. Brougham asked, using an expression of Mr. Canning’s, ‘to bear the mark of the chain remaining, after the fetter had been knocked away?’

The number of those whom the Test deprives of place, or excludes from office, may be few, because those who attain posts of honour and emolument are comparatively few. But how many does it deprive of the hope of attaining the object of an honourable ambition? What is its operation upon the mind of a young man starting in the career of distinction, whose educational principles and conscientious feelings lead him to view the Test as an obstacle in the way of his advancement? Can Protestant Dissenters be willing that such a stumbling-block should be laid in the way of their sons, such a check be imposed on their sanguine hopes, or such a temptation be held out to a compromise of principle? Surely this is a tangible grievance; and the tendency of the law is as hostile to the interests of morality, as it is oppressive and unjust.

The very grounds upon which the repeal of these acts is resisted, invest them with the character of a grievance. Those grounds are, an historical misrepresentation and a slanderous imputation. Dissenters are represented as not entitled to entire confidence; and to justify this injurious aspersion, these acts are appealed to as precautions sanctioned by the wisdom of our ancestors.

‘It is a manifest impropriety of speech’, says this Writer, ‘to call that privilege which the Dissenters ask from the legislature a political right, since the reason of their asking it lies in this; that the legislature heretofore declared and enacted that their possessing it did not consist with the safety of the state.’

A good argument by the way, for the opponents of the abolition of slavery in our colonies. Freedom can never be the political right of the slave, inasmuch as a British house of Commons did at a certain time declare and enact, that his emancipation did not consist with the safety of the West India colonies; and a previous house declared the slave-trade itself to be both lawful and necessary. Again:

‘I am at a loss to conceive how these Dissenters can have read history, who assert that they are made the victims of laws which were not intended to operate against them. There is a hardihood in this oft-repeated assertion which is really astonishing.’

The Writer has furnished us with the very word that best applies to his gross and scarcely credible mis-statements. We wish we could believe him ignorant of the fact, that those very Lords and Commons whom he represents as so ‘decidedly ‘hostile to the Dissenters,’ repeatedly passed bills virtually repealing the Test Act as it regarded them, which were defeated only by the manoeuvres of the Court. Even if he is ignorant of this fact, his assurance in so confidently denying it, is scarcely less excusable. Nor is it true, that the Corporation and Test Acts were specially preserved at the period of the Glorious Revolution, as ‘the necessary defence of the established Church,’ and ‘the strong bulwarks of the constitution.’ The only reason why they were not then repealed, was, the disaffection of the clergy to King William, the strength of the Jacobite party, and the offence taken by the Church at the introduction of the Toleration Act itself. King William openly expressed his wish, that all Dissenters who ‘were willing and able to serve,’ should be admitted to offices and places of trust; but the enlightened policy of the Protestant monarch was counteracted by a factious, bigoted, and disloyal clergy.

One word as to the “Statement” which the present Writer

has taken for his text. We freely confess that it does the Dissenting body little credit as a composition. We could have wished, too, that the circular forms of petition had consisted less of abstract positions and broad assertions, and kept a little more closely to the point. One lengthy form of petition which was transmitted to us, is so extremely ill written, that we defy any man to make sense or grammar of the sentence which occupied the last paragraph. But let it be remembered as some extenuation, that king's speeches have not always been grammatical, nor printed papers issued by a certain House always intelligible. Sometimes, as the old proverb says, 'too many cooks,' &c. And a sound lawyer or sage divine may be a very indifferent paragraph-maker.

We must make another concession to the present Writer. We join with him in fervently deprecating the spirit of Unitarianism in religion, and in cordial detestation of the political spirit which he imputes to Unitarians. Yet, we cannot agree with him in thinking that this spirit is peculiar to Unitarians. We should be disposed to regard the creed as in many cases the result of the spirit, rather than as its source. However this may be, we can by no means admit that the best way to counteract the growth of error is to visit it with civil penalties, or that the readiest way to win to the true Church, those who have erred from the faith, is to hold them up to public scorn and suspicion as enemies to their country. *Haud tali auxilio.*

Art. XV.—*The Character and Tokens of the Catholic Church; a Discourse delivered at Tavistock Chapel, Drury Lane, Nov. 20, 1827. By the Rev. R. Waldo Sibthorp, B.D. Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxon. 8vo. pp. 61. London, 1827.*

WE have great pleasure in recommending to the attention of our readers this truly Catholic, and at the same time firmly Protestant discourse. The subject is in some respects a delicate one, but it has fallen into judicious and masterly hands, and is treated with scriptural fidelity. 'Roman Catholics', Mr. Sibthorp remarks, 'are apt to suppose'—at least they are given to represent—'that because there are differences among Protestants as to forms of worship and some matters of Church discipline, there is therefore no unity of faith and doctrine; and that, on the other hand, because there is an external agreement in worship and discipline in their own Church, there is that entire unity of faith which entitles her exclusively to be considered the true Church.' Both these suppositions are shewn to be erroneous.

' All Protestant Churches concur in their belief of the articles of faith contained in the Apostles' Creed ; and that these are not unimportant, hear the testimony of the Church of Rome herself. In one of those books of instruction already quoted, is this :—*Q. What are the chief things which God teaches?* A. They are contained in the Apostles' Creed. Now, by *the chief things which God teaches*, does the Church of Rome mean things to be believed as essential to salvation or not? If she does, then all true Protestants, in believing the articles of the Apostles' Creed, believe all things essential to salvation. If she does not, then there are things essential to salvation, which are not among *the chief things which God teaches*. An absurdity which surely no Romanist will maintain. In the belief of "the chief things which God teaches," all true Protestants and true Christians, whether of England, or of Scotland, or of Germany, or of America concur. I say, therefore, brethren, that true Protestants, in every part of the earth, have herein a unity of faith, and just that unity, and just as much unity as the persons who compiled that and other ancient Creeds agreeing therewith, required. And in all the public confessions of faith, drawn up during the first four centuries after our Lord, all such Protestants agree. The Apostles' Creed, and indeed Creeds in general, may be defined to be, "A summary of articles of faith, expressing concisely and comprehensively, the doctrines held to be essentially necessary to everlasting salvation. The Holy Scriptures may, in a more extended sense, be called the Creed of Christians: but as these, beside the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, comprehend also a great variety of truths of less importance; it became expedient for the Church to frame a compendium of the articles of indispensable belief, which might be readily learned, easily understood, and effectually retained by each of its members."

' That unity of Faith which is characteristic of the true Church, is unity in the chief things which these Creeds deliver as compendious summaries of the principal doctrines of Scripture. And this unity Protestants have. And is this no unity? Are Protestants so immensely and inseparably divided? Is there no agreement among them, when all that the Church of Christ for the first four centuries publicly declared she held essential to Salvation, they publicly and constantly hold? Is there no unity of Faith among them, when one true and upright Protestant travelling through the earth, wherever he meets with another true and upright Protestant, shall find him believing in the same God, the same Saviour, the same Holy Ghost, the same way of Salvation by Faith in that Saviour's merits, the same necessity of holy living, and of dependance on Divine grace, and a renewal of heart and life, all the records of the same blessed volume of Inspired Truth; yea, every thing in the Apostles' and other ancient Creeds?

' And where, with the external appearance of concord so greatly boasted of in the Roman Church is her entire unity of Faith? I speak not now of unity of Spirit, but I ask where was the perfect unity of Faith in the members of that Church, when two of her most celebrated and zealous monastic orders disputed respecting the im-

maculate conception of the Virgin, the Franciscans as vehemently maintaining as the Dominicans opposed it?—when the Jesuits and Jansenists broke in upon the slumbers of their Church by long and loud contention respecting the doctrines of grace?—when it is a notorious fact, that not only Popes have decided against Popes, but Councils against Councils, and the Church of one age against the Church of another; and what canonized Saints taught in one age as Divine Truth, and was received as such in the Church for centuries, the Pope and his Cardinals in later times condemned as pernicious error? On a point of fundamental importance as it respects the authority of the Roman Church, and the obedience of her people, there is an entire disagreement among them; viz. where that Infalibility resides, on which she supports her pretensions; some placing it in the Pope alone, some in general councils, some in both united, and others, sometimes in one, and sometimes in the other. But on every essential and fundamental point, on every doctrine which the Sacred Scriptures teach, as necessary to Salvation, and which early Creeds, and early Fathers confirm as such, there is among true Protestants, and real Christians of every Church and age, a unity of Faith, and such as is essential to the true Unity of the Church.'

True Protestants, Mr. Sibthorp proceeds to remark, will concur also with Roman Catholics, in allowing that the Unity which is one requisite token of the true Church, is a Unity of Communion. Now among all real Christians, there is an entire communion in the object of worship. If uniformity of worship is designed by that term, such unity of communion does not exist in the Romish Church. There is, moreover, less even of external and actual communion of worship in Roman Catholic, than in Protestant congregations. But the communion existing between all true Christians, although it does not exclude, yet does not essentially consist in outward communion. This is the sign, not the thing signified,—the means, not the end.

'Assuredly then, Roman Catholics have no right to condemn Protestants as having no external communion in worship among themselves, because they have different forms of prayers, or because some have forms and some not, while there is so great a medley of devotion found among themselves. But if they intend not an unity in all external rights and ceremonies, then in how many and in what? Where do they draw the line? All great Protestant Churches receive the same Sacraments, of Baptism and the Lord's Supper: admit of the same leading parts of public worship, prayer and praise, and preaching of the word; nor do they differ so much even in external ceremonies as may be thought, seeing that in such as have most of these, they are few and simple. But if this "communion of all holy persons in all holy things," is not in externals, but is an internal and spiritual communion, such as I have already described, then does it not include every one, who by participation of the Holy

Ghost, is made a member of Christ's mystical body, a stone in his Spiritual Temple, an inheritor of Heaven? It is a communion to which no one Church has exclusive claims, or a superior claim above other Churches. It is a spiritual, invisible, but actual union. *Hereby know we that we dwell in him, and he in us, because he hath given us of his Spirit—whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God.*

'This, then, is the true Unity of the True Catholic Church: by which all the Faithful in every age and part of the world, by whatever name distinguished, are knit together into one body: a Unity in essentials; a real Unity as it respects subjection to one Head, agreement in one Faith, and Communion in One Spirit. Whereas, the unity which the Roman Church pretends, of subjection to an earthly head, the Pope, agreement in the belief of things neither taught in Scripture nor found in ancient confessions of faith, and communion in external rites, is an invention of her own to rivet more strongly those chains of spiritual domination by which she holds her members bound in the prison-house of her Superstition.'

'We admit that there have been, and are in the Church of Rome, many who belong to this company, and are a part of the One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic Church; for the Holy Spirit is not limited in the exercise of his power, nor the Saviour in the manifestation of his love.

'But we also must hold that the Church of Rome, so far from being one and the same as the Catholic Church of Christ, is an opponent thereof; and has, by her doctrines, her practices, and her spirit, kept many back from coming into the fold of Christ who would have entered: inasmuch as those doctrines are subversive of the gospel, those practices evil and dangerous deceits, and that spirit secular, domineering, and intolerant. And these things we undertake, with God's blessing, to prove to those who attend these lectures: and we essay this, not in anger, but in love; not with railing accusations, but plain arguments and facts; not with authority of man, but of the word of God, seeking not theirs but them, and *the profit of many that they may be saved.*

Art. XVI. 1. *Original Anniversary Hymns adapted to the Public Services of Sunday Schools and Sunday School Unions.* By Mrs. Gilbert (late Ann Taylor). 18mo. Price 6d. or 5s. per dozen. London. 1827.

2. *Hymns for Infant Schools.* Partly Original, and partly selected from "Hymns for Infant Minds," and "Original Hymns for Sunday Schools, by Ann and Jane Taylor." By Mrs. Gilbert (late Ann Taylor), Author of "Original Anniversary Hymns," &c. 12mo. Price 4d. or 3s. 6d. per dozen. London. 1827.

THE purest praise, we seem to have a sanction for saying, is that which proceeds from the lips of babes and sucklings. If our Lord himself seemed to take more delight in the ho-

sannas of the infant throng, than in all the noisy acclamations of the fickle multitude, surely it may be allowed to the Mother, the Teacher, and the Patroness of early education, to esteem far above any other plaudits, the homage of infant lips and infant minds. And if this is allowed, we know few individuals who enjoy a more enviable fame than the now only surviving Author of the *Hymns for Infant Minds*; a volume which we suppose is to be found in almost every pious family, the *Nursery Hymn-book*, and for which millions will have to bless the names of Ann and Jane Taylor.

The titles of the publications before us, sufficiently explain their object. The *Original Hymns* comprise, 1. Hymns to be sung by Children; 2. Hymns to be sung in the open air; and 3. Hymns to be sung by Teachers and Friends. From those of the second class, we select the following very striking specimen.

‘ THE LAST TRUMPET.

‘ Not as gaily now we stand,
Gazing on the open sky,
Shall we meet, when sea and land
From the Judge’s face shall fly,
When, from yonder heavens shall break,
Thunders that the dead awake !

‘ On a wide, a spreading plain,
Further far than eye can see,
Then we all shall meet again !
Solemn will that meeting be ;
God Almighty give us grace,
Heart and soul to seek his face.

‘ While we now thy praises sing,
When ere long we kneel in prayer,
To our minds the moment bring
When we shall assemble there,
When the trumpet’s blast shall say,
“ Time and Hope have passed away.” ’

We cannot pass by the very beautiful hymn entitled,

‘ THE HILL OF GOD.

‘ There is a hill both bright and high,
Where God himself is known ;
’Tis out of sight, above the sky,
’Tis God Almighty’s throne !

- ' And who are they who venture near
The throne of God to see?
Ten thousand happy ones, who here
Were children such as we!
- ' Their infant spirits stay'd awhile
With tender friends below,
But death came early with a smile,
And pleased they were to go.
- ' Their sins the Saviour washed away,
He made them white and clean;
They loved his word, they loved his day,
They loved Him, though unseen.
- ' Now, under many a grassy mound
Their bodies sweetly rest,
And safe their happy souls are found
Upon the Saviour's breast!
- ' O may we travel as they trod
The path that leads to heaven,
And seek forgiveness from that God
Who hath their sins forgiven.
- ' Dear Saviour, hear this humble cry,
And our young hearts renew,
That on the hill so bright and high,
We may behold Thee too.'

These specimens will sufficiently shew, that the Anniversary Hymns are fully equal in merit to the former productions of the Author.

ART XVII. SELECT LITERARY INFORMATION.

In the press, and speedily will be published, in 2 vols. 8vo., with a Map, &c. *Researches in South Africa.* By the Rev. John Philip, D.D. Superintendant of the Missions of the London Missionary Society in South Africa, &c. This work will contain an Account of the past and present condition of the Native Tribes within or adjoining the limits of the Cape Colony, comprising authentic details of the various attempts made to enslave or exterminate them; the success of the Missionaries in reclaiming them from barbarous and immoral habits, to a state of civilization; the opposition they have had to contend with, and the intolerable oppressions to which both the Missionaries and the Natives are still subjected. The Personal Observations of the Author during his various journeys and travels into the interior of the Country, will also, it is hoped, add to the interest of a work, of which one of the leading objects will be, to demonstrate the inseparable connection between Christianity and civilization.

In the press, *Christian Experience; or, a Guide to the Perplexed.* By Robert Philip.

In the press, *The Barn and the Steeple.* 'For the stone shall cry out of the wall, and the beam out of the timber shall answer it.' Hab. ii. 11.

In the press, and will speedily be published, *The Americans as they are.* Exemplified in a Tour through the Valley of the Mississippi; embracing Ohio, Kentucky, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Tennessee, Arkansas, Mississippi, Louisiana, &c. By the Author of 'Austria as it is.'

A Second Edition, greatly enlarged and improved, of *Hamilton's East India Gazetteer*, will appear in April, in 2 vols. 8vo. With Maps.

Mr. Allan Cunningham is preparing the first of a series of volumes, to be entitled, *The Anniversary; or, Poetry and Prose for 1829.* The work will be illustrated, under the superintendence of Mr. Sharpe, with Engravings from the most celebrated pictures of the British school.

In the press, and to be published the first of April, in 1 vol. 12mo. with Plates and Map, *Private Journal of a Voyage to the Pacific Ocean, and a residence in the Sandwich Islands during the years 1822, 1823, 1824, and 1825.* By C. S. Stewart, late American Missionary at the Sandwich Is-

lands. With an Introduction, and Occasional Notes. By the Rev. W. Ellis.

The Rev. George Payne, of Edinburgh, has in the press, *Elements of Mental and Moral Science*; designed to exhibit the original susceptibilities of the mind, and the rule by which the rectitude of any of its states or feelings should be judged.

Westley and Davis have announced a New Annual for 1829, to be entitled "The Evergreen; or, Christmas and New Year's Gift and Birth Day Present for 1829:" intended for Youth of both Sexes under the Age of Twelve Years.

The Juvenile Forget-me-not for 1829, is already announced; to appear in November.

The Author of the *Evangelical Rambler* is preparing a series of papers, which will appear periodically under the title of "The Evangelical Spectator."

The Rev. W. Garthwaite, of Wattisfield, intends to publish by subscription, a volume of Sermons, designed for Family or Village Reading. 7s. 6d.

In the press, *The Impious Feast.* A Poem, in Ten Books. By Robert Landor, M.A. Author of the *Count Arezzi*, a Tragedy. 8vo.

In the press, *Conversations*, chiefly on the Religious Sentiments expressed in *Madame de Staël's Germany.* By Mary Ann Keltly, Author of *Religious Thoughts.* 12mo.

In the press, *The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans; with an Introduction, Paraphrase, and Notes.* By C. H. Terrot, A.M. late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.

In the press, *A Brief Enquiry into the Prospects of the Christian Church*, in connection with the Second Advent of our Lord Jesus Christ. By the Hon. and Rev. Gerard Noel, Curate of Richmond, Surrey.

In the press, *Sermons.* By the Rev. James Procter, A.M. Fellow of Peter's College, Cambridge, late Curate of Bentley, Hants, and Assistant Minister of Farnham, Surrey.

In the press, *Hints designed to promote a profitable attendance on an Evangelical Ministry.* By the Rev. Wm. Davis, of Hastings.

The Rev. James Churchill has in the press, an Essay entitled, "The Way of Salvation and Christian Edification."

ART. XVIII. LIST OF WORKS RECENTLY PUBLISHED.

EDUCATION.

Virgil's *Æneid*, Book I. with an Interlinear Translation, on Mr. Locke's plan, and the Original Text, in which the quantity of the doubtful vowels is denoted. 2s. 6d.

Parsing Lessons to Virgil. Book I. 2s. 6d.

Cæsar's Invasion of Britain from the Commentaries, with an Interlinear Translation, &c. 2s. 6d.

A short Latin Grammar. 2s. 6d.

Homer's *Iliad*, Book I. with an Interlinear Translation; and the Original Text, in which the quantity of the doubtful vowels is denoted. 2s. 6d.

The Odes of Anacreon, with an Interlinear Translation, &c. 2s. 6d.

First Steps to the Latin Classics; comprising simple sentences, progressively arranged, directions for construing, and a literal interlinear Translation. With an Introductory Essay on the Study of the Latin Language, and an Appendix of Exercises. By James Hinton, A.M. and George Cox. 12mo. 2s. boards.

Greek Gradus; or, A Greek, Latin, and English Prosodial Lexicon; containing the Interpretation, in Latin and English, of all words which occur in the Greek Poets, from the earliest period to the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus, and also exhibiting the Quantities of each Syllable; thus combining the advantages of a Lexicon of the Greek Poets and a Greek Gradus: for the use of schools and colleges. By the Rev. J. Brasse, B.D. late Fellow of Trin. Coll. Cambridge. 8vo. 1l. 4s.

Second Latin Exercises, adapted to every Grammar, and intended as an Introduction to Valpy's '*Elegantiae Latinæ*.' 12mo. 2s. 6d. bound.

CLASSICAL LITERATURE.

Notes on Herodotus, historical and critical. Translated from the French of P. H. Larcher. 2 vols. 8vo. 1l. 10s.

Aristophanis Comœdiæ cum Scholiis et Varietate Lectionis. Recensuit Immanuel Bekkerus, Professor Berolinensis. Accedunt Versio Latina Deperditarum Comœdiarum Fragmenta, Index locupletissimus, Notæque Brunckii, Reisigii, Beckii, Dindorfii, Schutzi, Bentleii, Dobreei, Porsoni, Elmsleii, Hermannii, Fischeri, Hemsterhusii, Kuinoeli, Hopfneri, Conzii, Wolfii, &c. &c. 5 vols. 8vo. 3l. 15s.

* * The Notes form 3 vols. out of the 5, and may be had separate, 2l. 5s. A few copies are struck off on large paper, 5l. 15s. 6d. for the 5 vols. The *Plutus*, *Nubes*, *Aves*,

and *Ranæ*, being the four plays of Aristophanes which are usually read first, and the fittest to put into the schoolboy's hands, are each published with the Greek Scholia and Annotations, separately.

ORIENTAL LITERATURE.

Select Specimens of the Theatre of the Hindus, translated from the Original Sanscrit; together with an Account of the Dramatic System of the Hindus, Notices of their different Dramas, &c. By H. H. Wilson, Esq. Secretary to the Asiatic Society of Bengal, &c. 3 vols. 8vo. 1l. 10s.

MEDICINE.

A Practical and Pathological Inquiry into the Sources and Effects of Derangement of the Digestive Organs: embracing Dejection, Perversion, and some other Affections of the Mind. By William Cooke, M.R.C.S. Secretary to the Hunterian Society, &c. 8vo. 9s.

THEOLOGY.

Sermons on Practical Subjects. By the Rev. Edward Craig, Minister of St. James's Chapel, Edinburgh. 12mo. 5s. 6d. bd.

Lectures on the Points in Controversy between Roman Catholics and Protestants, preached at the Weekly Lecture at Tavistock Chapel. By the Hon. and Rev. Baptist Noel, Rev. Charles Jerram, Rev. J. H. Owen, Rev. Mr. Mutter. 1s. each.

Dialogues on Prophecy. Part 5. 2s.

* * Parts 1, 2, 3, and 4, may now be had.

The Nature of the First Resurrection, and the Character and Privilege of those that shall partake of it: a Sermon. By a Spiritual Watchman. 1s. 6d.

Four Discourses on the Sacrifice, Priesthood, Atonement, and Redemption of Christ. By J. Pye Smith, D.D. Author of the Scripture Testimony to the Messiah. 8vo. 8s.

The First Volume of "The Works of the English and Scottish Reformers." Edited by the Rev. Thomas Russell, A.M. 8vo. 10s. 6d.—50 Copies will be printed on a royal paper, price 1l. 1s.

Religion in India. By the Rev. S. Laidler and J. W. Massie, recently from India. 8vo. 9s.

The Balance of Criminality; or, Mental Error compared with Immoral Conduct. Addressed to Young Doubters. By Rev. Isaac Taylor of Ongar. 12mo. 3s. 6d.

Part II. of the Rev. John Morrison's Exposition of the Book of Psalms. 8vo.